

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
LIBRARY

Regulations Regarding Theses and Dissertations

Typescript copies of theses and dissertations for Master's and Doctor's degrees deposited in the University of Alberta Library, as the official Copy of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, may be consulted in the Reference Reading Room only.

A second copy is on deposit in the Department under whose supervision the work was done. Some Departments are willing to loan their copy to libraries, through the inter-library loan service of the University of Alberta Library.

These theses and dissertations are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the author. Written permission of the author and of the Department must be obtained through the University of Alberta Library when extended passages are copied. When permission has been granted, acknowledgement must appear in the published work.

This thesis or dissertation has been used in accordance with the above regulations by the persons listed below. The borrowing library is obligated to secure the signature of each user.

Please sign below:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A SURVEY OF SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES IN ALBERTA

BY

ROBERT BRYCE



A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FEBRUARY, 1968

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Survey of School Board Bursaries in Alberta" submitted by Robert Bryce in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer of this thesis gratefully acknowledges the assistance of those many individuals who contributed to its preparation. A particular debt is owed to his thesis committee, especially the writer's advisor, Dr. H. T. Sparby, for the guidance and assistance which was so kindly contributed throughout the project.

Further, the Registrar and the Chairman of the Student Assistance Board of the Department of Education of Alberta were most helpful in providing data. The response of school superintendents and student bursary recipients to the questionnaires which they received was most gratifying. Their cooperation is sincerely appreciated. Finally, the writer would like to express his thanks to his wife and children for the support which they alone can give.

ABSTRACT

Since 1947 various Alberta school boards have granted bursaries to teacher trainees in return for a commitment on the part of the recipients to teach for the granting boards. The purpose of this thesis was to survey this recruitment process in Alberta with particular regard to the current (1966-67) situation.

Data for this study were obtained from three primary sources:

- (1) the Alberta Department of Education;
- (2) superintendents of Alberta school jurisdictions; and
- (3) recipients of bursaries for the 1966-67 school year.

Bursary programs were found to be operated by the majority of Alberta school boards but were relatively little known in other Canadian provinces. In Alberta, bursaries offered to potential vocational instructors were supported by federal and provincial as well as local school board grants. School board bursaries directed to student teachers training in the academic areas were solely supported by local funds. Academic bursaries offered by non-city jurisdictions had a mean value of \$401 in 1966-67 which was higher than the mean value (\$300) of the same type of bursaries offered by cities. Vocational bursaries in both city and non-city areas

ranged between \$3,000 and \$5,000 in the school year 1966-67.

Neither superintendents nor bursary recipients attached much importance to bursaries as a device to attract students to teacher training. In regard to making university attendance possible for those interested in becoming teachers, superintendents were more inclined to judge the influence of bursaries as having some positive effect than were recipients. Only a small fraction (less than 1.0 per cent) of the students indicated that, in effect, their university attendance was made possible by school board bursaries.

A decided difference in opinion between superintendents and recipients was noted in regard to moral commitment in a bursary contract. Three-fourths of the superintendents felt that such a commitment existed while an even higher proportion of recipients did not.

Superintendents gave "obtaining a supply of teachers" as the major advantage they saw in granting bursaries while the failure of some students to complete the teaching commitment was the disadvantage most frequently cited. For recipients, the leading advantage by far was "financial assistance" while an objection to the teaching commitment was the near unanimous choice as the main disadvantage.

Twelve per cent of the sample of 1966-67 bursary recipients declared that they did not plan to report to

their bursary board while another 30 per cent expressed reservations in regard to completing the teaching commitment. In an employment review of bursary recipients of 1961-62, a significantly higher proportion of males than females returned to and remained with the bursary granting board. The factors most frequently designated by superintendents as contributing positively to the return of a bursary recipient to honor his teaching commitment were related to satisfactory local teaching conditions.

Twenty-eight bursary application and contractual forms were forwarded by superintendents. A review of these documents disclosed that a great deal of variation existed among the boards in both terms of the contract and type and format of the documents.

A conclusion of the survey was that school board bursaries were first and foremost local recruiting devices and that their contribution to the teacher "pool" and to making higher education possible was at best limited. In addition, there appeared good reason to suggest that bursaries tended to restrict the education of recipients to minimum certification standards before teaching was begun.

The major recommendation emanating from the study was that boards should carefully evaluate bursary programs directed at high school students. Suggestions were made

to modify existing bursary programs in order to eliminate undesirable features. Finally, a number of avenues for further research were suggested.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of Purpose and Sub-Purposes . . .	1
	Sub-Purposes	2
	Importance of the Study	2
	The Magnitude of the Practice	3
	The Use of School Board Bursaries as a Recruiting Device	3
	School Board Bursaries and Teacher Careers	6
	Definition of Terms	6
	Assumptions	7
	Scope of the Thesis	7
	Sources of Data and Methods of Collection .	9
II.	THE BACKGROUND TO SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES . .	13
	A National Shortage of Teachers	13
	Emergence of School Board Bursaries in Alberta	14
	The Formal Beginning	15
	Indications of Bursary Influence on University Attendance and Faculty Selection	16
	Rural Versus Urban Bursaries - A Recurring Problem	17
	Bursaries in the "Fifties"	18

CHAPTER	PAGE
Bursaries Revert to The Boards	21
Vocational Bursaries	21
III. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	26
The Use of School Board Bursaries	
Throughout Canada	26
Alberta School Board Bursaries 1961-	
62 to 1965-66	28
Alberta School Board Bursaries 1966-67 .	32
Bursary recipients as a Proportion of	
All Education Students	36
Distribution of Bursary Recipients. .	38
Financial Details of 1966-67 Bursaries	40
Chapter Summary	45
Bursaries in Alberta: 1966-67	47
IV. STUDENT RECIPIENTS OF SCHOOL BOARD	
BURSARIES 1966-67	49
Obtaining the Data.	49
The Questionnaire	50
Analysis of Data.	52
Results From Section one of the Question-	
naire: Information About Recipients .	52
Sex, University Year, and Program of	
Studies	53
Results From Section Two of the Question-	
naire: Information Recipients Provided	
About Bursaries	56

CHAPTER	PAGE
Sources of Information About	
Bursaries	56
Interviewing of Applicants	57
Contact With the Granting Board.	57
Number of Bursaries Received Versus	
The Teaching Commitment.	59
Decision on Taking Teacher Training	61
Data From Non-Transfer Students.	61
Decision Regarding Years of Training	65
Bursary Recipients and The Teaching	
Commitment	66
Choice of Area in Which to Start	
Teaching.	71
Second Thought About Taking a Bursary.	73
The Question of Moral Commitment	76
Student Opinion as to a Reasonable	
Bursary	79
Bursary Advantages and Disadvantages	80
Chapter Summary.	83
Respondents	83
Number of Bursaries.	84
Bursary Recipients and The Teaching	
Commitment	85
Moral Commitment.	87
A Reasonable Bursary	88

CHAPTER	PAGE
Advantages and Disadvantages:	
Positive and Negative Reactions . . .	88
V. SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES	90
Obtaining the Data	90
The Questionnaire	91
Results From the Questionnaire	94
Factual Details Reported by Superin-	
tendents	94
Do Boards Specify Years of Training? .	98
Opinions of Superintendents In Regard	
to Bursaries.	100
Estimates of Recipient Return.	101
Why Do Students Fail to Meet Their	
Teaching Commitment?	102
Is There a Moral Commitment to a	
Bursary Contract?	103
Influence of Bursaries on Teacher	
Training	105
The Likelihood of The Return of	
Recipients	106
Superintendents and The Monetary Value	
of Bursaries.	112
Do Superintendents Favor Bursaries? .	114
Advantages and Disadvantages of	
Bursary Programs	117
Final Commentary on Bursaries.	120

CHAPTER	PAGE
School Boards Which Did Not Operate a Bursary Program in 1966-67	122
Reasons For Not Operating a Bursary Program	122
Chapter Summary.	124
Opinions of Superintendents	126
VI. AN EMPLOYMENT HISTORY OF A SAMPLE OF BURSARY RECIPIENTS FROM 1961-62 . . .	131
The Sample	131
History of The Recipients	133
Bursary Recipients of 1961-62 Who Failed to Render Service to Their Bursary Board	140
Chapter Summary.	141
VII. BURSARY APPLICATION AND CONTRACTUAL DOCUMENTS.	144
General Information About the Documents.	145
Personal Information Required of Applicants.	145
Contractual Terms	147
The Teaching Commitment	148
Provisions in Regard to Breaking The Bursary Contract	150
Deferment of the Teaching Commitment .	152
Payment of Bursary Funds to Students .	153

CHAPTER	PAGE
Miscellaneous Contractual Items . .	154
Chapter Summary	155
VIII. FINDINGS - CONCLUSIONS - RECOMMENDATIONS -	
POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE STUDIES. . .	158
Major Findings.	158
Extent of the Practice	158
Financial Details	159
Contractual Terms	159
Data From Bursary Recipients . . .	161
Data From Superintendents.	163
Employment History of Recipients . .	165
Conclusions.	166
Recommendations	169
Program Termination	171
Further Studies	172
APPENDIX A: Correspondence from Provincial	
Education Departments Quoted in	
the Thesis.	174
APPENDIX B: A Copy of the Questionnaire Sent	
to Students Recipients of School	
Board Bursaries	179
APPENDIX C: Questionnaire Sent to Alberta	
School Superintendents.	186

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Government Supported School Board Bursaries in Alberta 1950 - 1959 . . .	19
II. Teacher Training Bursary Programs in The Canadian Provinces 1966 - 67. . . .	27
III. Bursaries Granted by Alberta School Boards 1961-62 to 1965-66.	30
IV. The Number and Percentage of Major Alberta School Jurisdictions Which Operated School Board Bursary Programs in 1966-67	33
V. 1966-67 School Board Bursary Recipients in Alberta.	35
VI. Bursary Recipients as a Proportion of the Full Time Education Student Population in Alberta 1966-67	38
VII. Distribution by University Year and by Sex of 1966-67 City and Non-City Bursary Recipients.	39
VIII. Total and Average Values of 690 Bursaries Granted by Alberta School Jurisdictions in 1966-67.	41
IX. Total and Mean Values of 1966-67 Non- Vocational Bursaries Granted by Alberta School Boards.	42
X. Actual Cost of Bursaries to City and Non- City School Boards 1966-67.	44

TABLE	PAGE
XI. Range, Mean, and Median Values of Non-Vocational School Board Bursaries 1966-67	45
XII. Distribution of Respondents by Sex, University Year and Program of Studies .	54
XIII. School Board - Recipient Contact After Bursary Granted.	58
XIV. University Entrance Standings as Reported By 1966-67 Bursary Recipients With no Prior University Training	63
XV. Will Those Who Plan to Teach for Their Bursary Board Complete The Full Commit- ment?	68
XVI. If Decision Could be Made Again, Would Students Take a Bursary From: The Same Board? A Different Board?	74
XVII. Distribution of Questionnaires Received From Superintendents	92
XVIII. Maximum Bursaries Issued vs Required Teaching Commitment	95
XIX. Do Boards Require Teaching Service After A Specific Number of Bursaries?	99
XX. Why Bursary Students Do Not Return - As Seen by Superintendents	103

TABLE	PAGE
XXI. Per Cent of Superintendents Estimating Various Degrees of Significance of Six Factors in Regard to Likelihood of The Return of a Bursary Recipient	108
XXII. Advantages of Bursary Programs to Boards (As Seen by Superintendents). . . .	118
XXIII. Disadvantages of Bursary Programs to Boards (As Seen by Superintendents) . .	119
XXIV. Certification and Teaching History of 247 1961-62 Bursary Recipients to January 1967	135
XXV. Teaching History and Marital Status of 1961-62 Female Bursary Recipients Who Taught in Alberta	139
XXVI. Personal Information Required in Twenty- Eight Bursary Application Forms. . . .	146

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1947 the school boards of two Alberta school jurisdictions offered "scholarships" of \$300 each to high school graduates who would agree to take a year of teacher training and then return to their respective districts to teach for three years. This plan of assisting teacher training in return for teaching service proved to be a harbinger of the Alberta school board bursary programs which were to come into popular usage throughout the next two decades.

The same general pattern of financial assistance to individuals who have the qualifications necessary to enter teacher training is in effect today. In return for monetary assistance, a bursary recipient undertakes to become a staff member of the issuing school board for a specific number of years as agreed upon at the time the contract is made. Although the practice is common within the province of Alberta, relatively little formal information about school board bursary programs has been available.

I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND SUB-PURPOSES

It was the purpose of this study to survey the current situation in regard to the use of teacher training bursaries by local school board or school committees

in Alberta. The current situation, (which for this study was the school year of 1966-67), was examined through four sub-purposes.

Sub-Purposes

- (1) To obtain and present basic details concerning the number, value, and contractual terms of the teacher training bursaries issued by Alberta school boards in 1966-67.
- (2) To survey current bursary recipients in an attempt to obtain descriptive statistics concerning these individuals, and to investigate some of the impressions and opinions recipients have of school board bursaries.
- (3) To obtain data, opinions, and viewpoints, concerning bursaries, from the administrative officers directly involved in granting them.
- (4) To review the employment history of a selected sample of bursary recipients from a previous year in order to provide background information and add perspective to an examination of the current situation.

II. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The importance of this study may be traced to three basic considerations:

- (1) the magnitude of the practice in Alberta;

- (2) the question of the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of teacher training bursaries by a school board to meet a local shortage of teachers; and
- (3) the fact that school board bursaries for teacher education are largely directed towards relatively inexperienced high school graduates.

The Magnitude of the Practice

How many students in Alberta received school board bursaries in 1966-67? What amount of money was expended on the practice? What proportion of school jurisdictions in Alberta operated bursary programs for potential teachers? Was the practice relatively unique to Alberta or fairly common throughout the Canadian nation? Questions such as these led to a preliminary examination of the subject. Initial findings suggested that the apparent magnitude and ubiquity of the practice in Alberta warranted formal study.

The Use of School Board Bursaries as a Recruiting Device

The importance of this study is inevitably linked to the total problem of securing staff for schools. The problem of recruiting and retaining primary and secondary school teachers would appear to be of continuing difficulty in Canada. Samson has suggested that the question of staffing is the single greatest problem faced by Canadian

superintendents. (3, p. 476) It would seem important, then, to investigate school board bursary programs as a means of meeting the staffing problem. It is suggested that the advantages and disadvantages, the successes and the failures of locally operated bursary programs is of interest not only to school administrators within Alberta but also to those in other provinces who may contemplate the use of such a procedure.

Differences in viewpoint regarding the most satisfactory approach to a solution to the teacher shortage appear to be evident in the Alberta scene. The Alberta Teachers' Association (hereafter referred to as the A.T.A.) has expressed the view that school staff needs should be met through the "high standards" approach. (1, p. 51) High standards, according to this point of view lead to a high professional status. A profession which is held in high public regard has a magnetism of its own which will attract and retain personnel. As to the very real difficulties which some Alberta regions (particularly rural areas) have experienced in staffing their schools, the A.T.A. has advised boards to look to the improvement of local working conditions (including salary) as the most effective means to solve their personnel problems. (1, pp. 45-46) In regard to bursaries in general, the A.T.A. has taken the position that their use should be welcomed as a means to extend

teacher education. (1, p. 47) This argument is based on studies which the A.T.A. suggests show a significant relationship between years of teacher education and retention in the profession. (1, p. 37) The A.T.A. has opposed any school guidance, career events or teacher influence which may "pressure students into teaching". (1, p. 46)

It would seem that a difference may exist between the staffing processes supported by the A.T.A. and the bursary programs that are operated by certain Alberta school boards. School board bursaries would seem to place emphasis on making teacher training a financially attractive proposition while the counter approach is to make teaching itself an attractive career. If such a difference of viewpoint does exist, it is of more than academic interest. A recent study has predicted that the output of teachers from the University of Alberta at Edmonton will not balance the teacher requirements of northern Alberta throughout the decade of 1965-66 to 1975-76. (2, Table IX, p. 19)

It would seem reasonable to suggest then that for at least the next ten years there will be continued competition for a limited supply of teachers. Which philosophy will be emphasized in staffing policies of the future remains to be seen. It is suggested, however, that the continued existence of a need to develop satisfactory staffing procedures lends support to the argument that an

examination of present programs, such as the local bursary approach, is a necessity.

School Board Bursaries and Teacher Careers

It is suggested that it is of considerable importance to examine the views and opinions of both recipients and granters of school board bursaries. In a "recruiting" or "staffing" process in which financial grants are offered to inexperienced young men and women in return for future professional service it is suggested that more may be at stake than maintaining a ratio between children to be educated and staff to be employed. The future careers of young people, with all their hopes and aspirations, may be inextricably meshed with local bursary programs. It is a contention of this thesis that the philosophies, ethics, and viewpoints which revolve about the subject warrant review.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Teacher training bursary. This term refers to a sum of money granted by an institution, or a corporation, for the express purpose of providing financial assistance to the recipient during the period he is receiving instruction at a teacher training institution. In return, the recipient is obligated to serve in a teaching position as specified by the granting authority for a period of time stipulated in the original agreement.

School board bursary. Throughout this thesis this term shall be interpreted as meaning a teacher training bursary granted by a divisional or district school board or a school committee of a county.

Where the term "bursary" appears it shall be understood to mean a "school board bursary" unless specifically defined otherwise.

School board or board. This term shall be understood to mean the legally constituted school board of a division or a district or the school committee of a county.

Bursary recipient. Unless otherwise indicated, this term shall be interpreted as meaning the recipient of a school board bursary.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

This study must assume:

- (1) That the responses given by respondents to the various questionnaires were frank and truthful.
- (2) That the data obtained from the files of the Department of Education were accurate.
- (3) That where samples were taken, such samples were adequate representations of the whole.

V. SCOPE OF THE THESIS

The scope of the thesis has been restricted in the following particulars:

- (1) In-depth analysis of bursary programs was confined to those operated within the province of Alberta.
- (2) The major emphasis of this study was placed on a survey of the current situation; i.e., the school year 1966-67. Descriptive statistics concerning past operations of bursary programs were included to provide a background against which present circumstances might be more meaningfully viewed.

In addition, the major focus of the study was directed at examining those bursaries which were offered to students proceeding directly from high school to university for teacher training. Limited attention was given to recipients of vocational bursaries. Vocational bursaries were those granted to skilled individuals who qualified under the Federal government's Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act of 1961 for financial assistance during their training as vocational instructors. This type of bursary, and its connection with local school boards, will be examined in greater detail in later chapters.

Two other types of bursaries received only passing attention. Some boards grant "specialty bursaries" to qualified teachers (usually current staff members) who agree to accept financial assistance for training in a special area in return for a guarantee of teaching service.

On occasion such specialists as librarians and guidance counsellors have been obtained by boards through such assistance. "Summer session bursaries" constitute financial assistance to staff members who take subjects, approved by their school board, at university summer training sessions. Inasmuch as both "speciality" and "summer session" bursaries are directed at individuals who already hold teacher certification, neither has been included in the scope of the thesis.

VI. SOURCES OF DATA AND METHODS OF COLLECTION

Data for this study were collected from three major sources:

- (1) The Alberta Department of Education;
- (2) Provincially and locally appointed school superintendents; and
- (3) Student recipients of school board bursaries.

Additional sources of information included the nine other Canadian provincial Departments of Education, various departments of the University of Alberta (Edmonton), and a number of publications identified in the thesis.

Collection methods. Information obtained from the Department of Education was garnered through direct reference to certain files to which the chairman of the Students' Assistance Board and the Registrar of the Department of Education permitted access. Questionnaires

were prepared for collection of data from superintendents and bursary recipients respectively. A letter of inquiry concerning school board bursaries was forwarded to all provincial Departments of Education outside of Alberta.

Treatment of data. Most of the data from the formal documents and records of the Alberta Department of Education and from the questionnaires were coded and transferred to IBM cards. Some information did not lend itself to computer categorization and was reviewed and interpreted in a direct manual process. Coded data were analyzed using the computer programs and equipment available through the Division of Educational Research of the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta (Edmonton).

Categorizations throughout the thesis were primarily of a nominal nature. For this reason chi-square analysis was considered the most appropriate statistical test of relationship. A cross-tabulation program provided by the Division of Educational Research was used for chi-square analysis. Included in the program were weights which indicated the direction of difference among distributions. Further, the program included an automatic Yates correction where cell frequencies of five or less were involved.

Statistical significance. The term "significant" when used in a statistical sense throughout this thesis

shall be interpreted as meaning the achievement of the .05 level of confidence or less.

CHAPTER I - BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Alberta Teachers' Association, Brief to the Alberta Commission on Education, 1958. Edmonton: April 1958. 198 pp.
- (2) Faculty of Education. Interim Brief to Academic Planning Commission. A brief prepared at the University of Alberta (Edmonton), March, 1966.
- (3) Sampson, L. P. "A Survey of The Methods of Selection and the Conditions of Employment of Provincially Employed Superintendents and Inspectors of Schools in The English Speaking Provinces of Canada." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1965. Vol. 2, pp. 301-644.

CHAPTER II

THE BACKGROUND TO SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES

I. A NATIONAL SHORTAGE OF TEACHERS

During the 1940's Canada experienced a serious shortage of teachers. In 1948 Gillespie noted in the Alberta Teachers' Association Magazine that the lack of teachers was acute at the time but should the current conditions persist, in ten years Canada would have a shortage of over 10,000 teachers. (10, p. 19) In the same year (1948) Fowler examined the teacher shortage throughout Canada (a shortage which he termed both critical and ridiculous) and recommended that more members be attracted to teaching through increased scholarships for normal-school students and federal subsidies for accelerating teacher training programs. (16, p. 186)

Suggestions, such as Fowler's, for increasing the supply of teachers through easing the financial barriers to teacher training became common operational practices of provincial governments and are in existence to the present day. However, the direct participation by a large number of local school boards in providing financial assistance to teacher training in return for teacher service became somewhat unique to Alberta.

II. EMERGENCE OF SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES IN ALBERTA

As was the case for the rest of the nation, the majority of Alberta school boards experienced a limited supply of teachers in the years immediately following World War II. The 1950 Annual Report of the Department of Education indicated that the peak of the shortage was in 1946 but still stood at nearly 300 in 1949. (13, 1950, p. 62)

In 1947 the Alberta Trustees' Association (A.S.T.A.) passed a resolution urging increased government grants which were to be specifically applied (by way of salary bonuses and scholarships) to students entering the teaching profession. The object of this resolution was stated as, "A means of relieving the teacher shortage by inducing students to become teachers." (3, p. 5)

Two months later the Alberta government responded to the A.S.T.A. urgings by offering free tuition to those taking the one year teacher training course. (5, p. 2) In addition, two hundred "scholarships" of \$200 each were offered to selected Alberta high school graduates who would agree to take a year of training and teach in the province for a minimum of two years.

This measure may have encouraged general enrolment in the Faculty of Education but individual areas were still left with no assurance that their particular staff needs

would be met. Consequently, the districts of Camrose and Wainwright received the accolades of the A.S.T.A. in 1947 when they first offered bursaries to the value of \$300 for candidates who would agree to teach a minimum of three years for the issuing board. (5, p. 4) The measure apparently met with the approval of the provincial authorities as well as the A.S.T.A., for government support of the program was soon to follow.

The Formal Beginning

An Alberta School Trustee editorial of 1958 cites the formal beginning of school board bursaries as 1949 when the Alberta government agreed to pay one-half of any \$300 bursary offered by school boards for first or second year teacher training. (9, pp.3-5) The recipient was required to sign an undertaking to teach for the issuing school board for two years immediately after completing his one or two year training program.

Sharing the cost of school board bursaries, however, was far from constituting the provincial government's sole financial assistance towards teacher recruitment. An outline of the entire provincial program operative in 1949 is as follows:

- (a) Tuition payment for all students in the seven months teacher training course which led to two year temporary certification. (This was the "Temporary Licence Plan").
- (b) "Scholarships" of \$200 each were

offered in return for teaching in the province for two years. Recipients of these scholarships could select any area within the province to complete their commitment but were ineligible to receive a school board bursary in addition to the \$200.

- (c) A contribution of \$150 towards each school board bursary providing that the total of the bursary was for a minimum of \$300. (12, pp. 49-50)

The latter device, school board bursaries, was acknowledged to be particularly successful in attracting teachers with no less than 314 granted in the initiating year. (12, p. 50)

There appeared to be little reaction from the Alberta Teachers' Association to the government supported school board bursary program. A review of the A.T.A. Magazine for 1949 revealed only one reference to the subject. The editor facetiously suggested that rather than offering a grade twelve student "a couple of hundred dollars", a much more attractive device would be to hold an annual \$100,000 raffle exclusively for teachers! (11, p. 33)

III. INDICATIONS OF BURSARY INFLUENCE ON UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE AND FACULTY SELECTION

There were some indications in the early 1950's that university attendance and in particular, teacher training, was being influenced by the availability of school board bursaries. Ackroyd and Roberts noted that

46 per cent of the sample population of Alberta matriculants who had university entrance standing in 1949 but did not attend university named financial difficulty as a primary factor in their failure to do so. (1, p. 59) These authors gave implicit recognition to the then current efforts to remove the financial barriers to teacher training by recommending that the financial assistance extended to prospective teachers be made available to other faculties. (1, p. 66)

More direct support of the contention regarding the influence of financial assistance on faculty selection was supplied in a brief prepared by the Faculty of Education in 1953. "There is little doubt," the authors state, "that financial assistance does bring students into the Faculty of Education." (14, pp. 10-11)

The brief concluded that larger bursaries and grants would help more grade twelve graduates attend university and if extended to the second year of training would encourage more to take that route. (14, p. 22)

IV. RURAL VERSUS URBAN BURSARIES -

A RECURRING PROBLEM

In 1953 the Alberta School Trustee noted that only divisional boards were now participating in the plan and passed a resolution requesting city school boards to "give consideration to the offering of bursaries to some

of their own grade twelve graduates in an endeavour to induce them to enter the Faculty of Education to train as teachers." (6, p. 2) Rural trustees complained that cities were drawing experienced teachers from the country while failing to train new ones. The editor of the Alberta School Trustee echoed this complaint again in 1955; (7, p. 6), then noted with satisfaction in 1958 that Edmonton had increased its bursary program to forty-five students over the thirty-two granted in the previous year. (9, p. 4) Relative to the student populations of rural and district areas, however, the bursary program received disproportionately greater support from rural counties and divisions than from city or town school districts.

V. BURSARIES IN THE "FIFTIES"

During the decade of the "fifties" the school board bursary program became an established and relatively stable part of teacher recruitment practice in Alberta as Table I indicates.

During this decade the Alberta government continued the student assistance programs as outlined for 1949. As a further measure to increase the supply of teachers the "Emergency Teacher Training Act" was in effect from 1952 to 1958. This act entitled graduates of a six week university summer session to teach for a one year period.

TABLE I
GOVERNMENT SUPPORTED SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES IN
ALBERTA 1950 - 1959

Year	No. Granted
1950	307
1951	(not published)
1952	193
1953	200
1954	250
1955	242
1956	245
1957	271
1958	382
1959	444

Note: (1) Information for this table was obtained from the Annual Reports of The Department of Education, Government of Alberta, for the years listed.

(2) This table does not include the school board bursaries granted to other than first or second year students. Boards which granted such bursaries received no financial assistance for them.

(13, 1959, pp. 87-88) Further Teacher certification was contingent upon additional summer training.

In addition to matching the government contribution of \$150 towards each bursary, school boards began to expand upon the program in two ways:

- (1) by increasing their contribution to make the bursary even more attractive; and
- (2) granting bursaries to third and fourth year students in the Faculty of Education and to

graduates from other faculties who took teacher training.

Bursaries to students beyond the first and second year received no government subsidization nor were details concerning the numbers granted or the finances involved published in the Department's Annual Reports.

Clover Bar School Division, now the County of Strathcona, was among those units which expanded upon the program. In 1955 Clover Bar offered ten, \$600 bursaries, to Home Economics, Business Education, or Industrial Arts students who would proceed beyond a two year program and undertake to graduate with a degree in their specialty and teach for the division. (7, pp. 5-6)

In the last year of the decade of the "fifties" the Alberta government introduced legislation which was of considerable significance to the school board bursary program. The various plans which provided financial aid to students were completely revamped under the "Students Assistance Act 1959", which was designated "The Queen Elizabeth Education Scholarship Fund" in honor of the Queen's visit that year.

Previous support programs, including the \$150 subsidy to school board bursaries, were withdrawn and replaced by a variety of scholarships, grants, and loans made available to both university and high school students. Assistance for the university group was provided in four primary areas:

- (1) students entering university for the first time;
- (2) other undergraduate students;
- (3) students in education;
- (4) graduate students. (13, 1961, p. 94)

Education students received a substantial portion of the funds available under the Act. In 1961, for example, of the \$902,938 allotted to university students, \$363,101 (40 per cent) went towards tuition grants alone for undergraduates in Education. (13, 1961, p. 44)

Bursaries Revert to The Boards

Provincial financial support for school board bursary programs was officially supposed to end in 1959 but in fact was continued through 1960 in order to phase out the practice as far as the provincial government's part was concerned. In that year 481 bursaries were granted. (13, 1960, p. 19)

From 1960 onward the type of bursary programs initiated in 1947 again became the exclusive function of the individual boards. Because the Department was no longer financially involved, its Annual Reports contained no accounting of the bursary practices which various boards developed or maintained.

Vocational Bursaries

In 1961 the government of Canada enacted legislation under the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act

which up to April of 1967 provided an estimated \$471,333,000 of federal funds to assist provinces develop vocational training institutions and programs. (15, pp. 368-369)

To attract skilled tradesmen from industry to become the much needed instructors in the burgeoning vocational area, federal, provincial and local school authorities combined forces in Alberta in 1962-63 to provide fairly substantial vocational bursaries.

In the early years of the program (1962-63) bursaries to potential vocational instructors ranged from \$1,500 to \$3,000 per year depending on whether or not a recipient supported dependents. By the 1966-67 school year vocational bursaries sponsored by local school boards had risen to \$3,000 and \$5,000. The amount of money actually contributed by local school boards was \$600 and \$1,000 respectively. The provincial government contributed 80 per cent of the remainder of the bursary while the federal authorities contributed 20 per cent. Recipients were eligible to receive only one of these \$3,000 or \$5,000 bursaries for a single year of approved training. They were then expected to teach for a two year period for the school board which had sponsored their bursary.

Types of bursary programs. A number of school jurisdictions in Alberta thus came to offer what were in effect two types of bursary programs. In one program bursary recipients were largely unskilled teenagers proceeding

directly from high school to university for teacher training. Rarely, as will be noted in the following chapter, would the value of their bursary exceed \$500. The second type of program was one in which school jurisdictions with vocational training facilities entered into financial arrangements with other authorities to offer bursaries ranging from \$3,000 to \$5,000 to skilled men and women interested in becoming instructors in their particular trade. It was with the former program, the type directed towards young high school graduates, that this thesis was principally concerned.

In 1965 the A.S.T.A. published a bulletin which reported on an informal survey that organization had conducted on school board bursaries. The bulletin reported that,

Although the survey did not represent complete returns from all divisions, counties and districts, it is evident that very few major school jurisdictions in Alberta are without bursary programs in teacher education. (2, p. 1)

In the following chapter (Chapter III) the development of bursary programs through the "sixties" will be briefly outlined followed by more extensive descriptive statistics of the state of bursary affairs in the school year 1966-67.

CHAPTER II - BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Ackroyd, A. O., and Roberts, W. G. "Post School Occupations of Students Who Graduated with University Matriculation from Alberta High Schools in 1949." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1952, 67 pp.
- (2) Alberta School Trustees Association. School Board and School Committee Bursaries for Students In Teacher Education. Association Bulletin No. 5, 1965. 11 pp.
- (3) Alberta School Trustees Association. The Alberta School Trustee. 1947, Vol. 17, No. 1.
- (4) _____. The Alberta School Trustee. 1947, Vol. 17, No. 3.
- (5) _____. The Alberta School Trustee. 1947, Vol. 17, No. 4.
- (6) _____. The Alberta School Trustee. 1953, Vol. 23, No. 2.
- (7) _____. The Alberta School Trustee. 1955, Vol. 25, No. 9.
- (8) _____. The Alberta School Trustee. 1956, Vol. 26, No. 11.
- (9) _____. The Alberta School Trustee. 1958, Vol. 28, No. 7.
- (10) Alberta Teachers' Association, The A.T.A. Magazine, 1948, Vol. 28, No. 2.
- (11) _____. The A.T.A. Magazine, 1949, Vol. 29, No. 6.
- (12) Department of Education. Annual Report of The Province of Alberta 1949, King's Printer, Edmonton. 160 pp.
- (13) _____. All subsequent Annual Reports of The Department of Education will be identified by the year of the particular report.
- (14) Faculty of Education. The Teacher Shortage in Alberta. A brief prepared at the University of Alberta, 1953. 22 pp.
- (15) Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canada One Hundred 1867 - 1967. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1967. 501 pp.
- (16) Fowler, W. T. M. "Teacher Demand and Supply in Canada." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1948. 187 pp.

- (17) Kershaw, J. A., and McKean, R. N. Teacher Shortages and Salary Schedules. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1962. 203 pp.
- (18) Massey, H. W., and Vineyard, E. E. The Profession of Teaching. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961. 210 pp.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

In this chapter, basic descriptive statistics will be presented to provide an accounting of school board bursaries in Alberta. The focus, at first relatively broad, will be gradually narrowed to center on the circumstances of the school year 1966-67.

I. THE USE OF SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES THROUGHOUT CANADA

How widespread was the use of bursary programs by local boards in 1966-67? A letter of enquiry was sent to the Departments of Education of all Canadian provinces other than Alberta. The information obtained from this source is presented in Table II.

In addition to Alberta, local school boards in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia were reported as having operated school board bursary programs in 1966-67. The Deputy Minister of Education for Nova Scotia stated in a letter of reply that the practice was not very widespread in his province with not more than two or three school boards operating such a plan. (Appendix A) In Saskatchewan, the practice was apparently more common. The Assistant Deputy Minister stated that a number of school unit boards have offered bursaries of the same type

TABLE II

TEACHER TRAINING BURSARY PROGRAMS IN THE
CANADIAN PROVINCES 1966 - 67

Type of Bursary Program	Number of Provinces	Names of Provinces
School Board Bursaries	3	Alberta, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan
Provincial Bursary Plan	3	Manitoba, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland
Nil School Board Bursary Programs	7	Quebec, Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island

as those offered by division school boards in Alberta.

(Appendix A) However the Saskatchewan Education Department had no records as to the exact number of boards so involved. Saskatchewan's Assistant Deputy Minister also forecasted that financial assistance to boards offering bursaries for one year of specialty training, (vocational, guidance, library, and like services), would be in effect in 1967-68. (Appendix A) However, no mention was made of any provincial government support for ab initio, non-specialty, teacher trainees.

Provincial bursary plans. Provincial bursaries are those offered by the government of a province (as opposed to local boards) for financial assistance to

teachers in training. Each of the three provinces, Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, (as per Table II), which offered provincial bursaries in 1966-67, required an undertaking on the part of the recipient to teach in the granting province for a stipulated number of years.

An official of the Ontario Department of Education stated that provincial teacher training bursaries of \$500 would be initiated in the 1967-68 school year.

(Appendix A) Of interest in this regard is Prince Edward Island's experience with provincial bursaries for teachers in training. After many years of offering teacher trainees a bursary of \$400, the plan was dropped in 1966. The reasons given were:

- (1) despite the bursary, many recipients left the province to teach elsewhere; and
- (2) new salary schedules were believed to now be attractive enough to induce young people to take up teaching and remain in the province.

(Appendix A)

Alberta School Board Bursaries 1961-62 to 1965-66

From 1961-62 to the year of this study, no official record has been kept by any agency in regard to the number of school board bursaries offered in Alberta. However, the Students Assistance Board of the Department of Education has kept an unofficial accounting. This Board is in charge of the allocation of the educational assistance funds

described in Chapter II. In order to ascertain the financial need of an applicant, the Board checks the name of the applicant against its lists of bursary recipients. These lists, which are obtained through the co-operation of the officials of local school jurisdictions, include the names of the recipients and the value of the bursaries issued for a given year.

Table III has been derived from information obtained from the Students Assistance Board and from the Department of Vocational and Industrial Training at the University of Alberta, Edmonton. This department, the only one of its kind in Alberta, co-ordinates the university training of vocational instructors. Information files maintained by the latter source include a notation as to whether or not the trainees have received school board bursaries.

School jurisdiction areas noted in Table III have been dichotomized into "city" and "non-city" boards. City boards include all school jurisdictions which lie within those municipal boundaries in Alberta designated as "cities" by the 1966 Canada Year Book. Non-city boards include all school divisions, counties, and school districts which lie outside the boundaries of cities. The public school system of one Alberta city joined with a rural school division in May of 1965 to form the only combined city and non-city area in Alberta which operates under a single school board. Three students were given bursaries by this board in 1965-66.

TABLE III
BURSARIES GRANTED BY ALBERTA SCHOOL BOARDS
1961-62 TO 1965-66

Bursaries Granted By	School Years					Grand Totals
	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	
<u>City Boards</u>						
Number	97	47	88	47	55	334
Total Value	\$ 18,950	5,450	208,000	166,650	165,400	564,450
Mean Value	\$ 195	115	2,364	3,546	3,012	1,690
<u>Non-City Boards</u>						
Number	540	122	320	231	313	1,526
Total Value	\$161,300	43,725	102,500	88,675	145,700	541,900
Mean Value	\$ 299	358	320	384	466	355
<u>All Boards</u>						
Number	637	169	408	278	368	1,860
Total Value	\$180,250	49,175	310,500	255,325	311,110	1,106,360
Mean Value	\$ 283	291	761	918	845	595

Note: (1) Vocational bursaries were offered beginning in the 1962-63 school year. However distribution figures for this year were incomplete and were omitted from the table.

(2) All monetary values were rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

Because the only vocational school in this jurisdiction was within the city sector, those students with vocational bursaries were classified as "city recipients". Those with academic bursaries were arbitrarily categorized as "non-city recipients".

City and non-city classification. The terms "city" and "non-city" were used because it was believed that a more meaningful dichotomy would be obtained than a "rural" and "urban" categorization. "Urban areas" refers to towns as well as cities. It was felt that the differences between towns and cities in Alberta, particularly in regard to attracting and retaining teachers, were sufficient to warrant differentiation.

Comments on Table III. The mean value of non-city bursaries throughout the five year period covered by Table III advanced from a low of \$299 in 1961-62 to a high of \$466 by 1965-66. Bursaries granted by city boards showed a much more striking change in value during the same five year period. City bursaries which had an average value of \$195 in the school year 1961-62 had risen to an average of \$2,363 per bursary by 1963-64. The mean value remained above \$2,000 to the end of the period. The principal reasons which may be given to account for this sharp increase was the drop in popularity of the use of academic bursaries by some cities, accompanied

by a rapid rise in the number of vocational bursaries which city boards offered. Whereas, through 1961-62 to 1962-63, bursaries granted by city boards to students proceeding directly from high school to university had averaged less than \$200 per bursary (Table III), vocational bursaries granted between 1962-63 to 1965-66 had a value range of \$1,500 to \$4,000 each. The average value of city bursaries from 1963-64 to 1965-66, as noted in Table III, reflects the fact that during this period, 31.1 per cent of city bursaries had a value of \$2,000 or more. No less than 18.2 per cent of all city bursaries had a value of \$4,000 each. In the same period only 0.6 per cent of all non-city bursaries had a value of \$2,000 or more.

II. ALBERTA SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES 1966 - 67

With the foregoing review of the previous years of the 1960's as a background, the focus of the remainder of this chapter has been centered on the current year of the study, the school year 1966-67. The survey included assessments of the following circumstances:

- (1) popularity of bursary programs among
Alberta school jurisdictions,
- (2) total number of bursary recipients and their
number in relation to all Alberta students
receiving teacher training,

- (3) distribution by program, university year, and sex, of the bursaries granted by city and non-city jurisdictions,
- (4) financial statistics concerning total, mean, and median values of 1966-67 school board bursaries.

Bursary popularity. How common, amongst the major school jurisdictions of Alberta, was the practice of offering teacher training bursaries in 1966-67? Table IV illustrates the extent of the practice.

TABLE IV

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MAJOR ALBERTA SCHOOL JURISDICTIONS WHICH OPERATED SCHOOL BOARD BURSARY PROGRAMS IN 1966-67

School Jurisdiction	No. in the Province	No. with Bursary Programs	Per Cent with Bursary Programs
School Divisions	32	27	84.4
Counties	28	24	85.7
Independent Towns	14	3	21.4
City Public School Districts	9	7	77.7
City Separate School Districts	10	3	30.0

Note: The few non-divisional, non-city school districts (such as those operating in the resort areas of Jasper and Banff) were not considered "major jurisdictions" and were excluded from Table IV.

It may be noted from Table IV that twenty-four of twenty-eight counties (85.7 per cent) operated bursary programs in 1966-67. Following, in order of proportion, were:

- (1) twenty-seven of thirty-two school divisions (84.4 per cent);
- (2) seven of nine city public school systems (77.7 per cent);
- (3) three of ten city separate school systems (30 per cent); and
- (4) three of fourteen independent towns (21.4 per cent).

Table IV indicates that the larger proportion of counties, divisions and city public school systems in Alberta offered bursaries in 1966-67. However, of the seven city public systems which operated bursary programs in 1966-67, only four offered bursaries to students proceeding directly from high school to university for teacher training. Each of these seven systems granted bursaries to experienced individuals who could qualify for a vocational or specialty training bursary. Three city public school systems, including the two largest in Alberta offered only the latter type of bursary. From the standpoint then of young high school graduates of 1966 interested in financial assistance for teacher training, bursaries were far more likely to be offered

by rural counties and divisions than by city school boards. Vocational bursaries for experienced individuals however, were more common to city boards. Table V, which accompanies the next section, provides additional evidence in this regard.

Bursary recipients: 1966-67. How many recipients of school board bursaries were there in Alberta in 1966-67? Data from the Students Assistance Board and from the Department of Vocational and Industrial Education are presented in Table V.

TABLE V

1966-67 SCHOOL BOARD BURSARY RECIPIENTS IN ALBERTA

Jurisdiction	Vocational Bursaries	Non-Vocational Bursaries	Total Bursaries
City Boards	69	68	137
Non-city Boards	11	542	553
Grand Total	80	610	690

Note: Statistics from the Students Assistance Board were obtained in January of 1967 and represent reports supplied to this board by Alberta school jurisdictions in the last quarter of 1966. Supporting data from the Department of Vocational and Industrial Education at the University of Alberta (Edmonton) were obtained in May of 1967. The number of students who may have received school board bursaries subsequent to the listings prepared by these data sources was not available for inclusion in Table V.

It may be noted from Table V that 69 out of 137 students (50.3 per cent) who had received a bursary from a city board were recipients of vocational bursaries. Only 11 of 553 students (1.9 per cent) who received non-city bursaries were recipients of the vocational type. A grand total of 690 bursaries was reported by the data sources as being distributed by school boards to teacher trainees during the 1966-67 school year.

Sex of recipients. Identification of the sex of bursary recipients was possible through the names listed among the data sources. Occasionally the listing of initials in place of given names required further reference to the student files maintained by the university Registrar. Of the 690 bursary recipients of 1966-67, 393 (57.0 per cent) were females and 297 (43.0 per cent) were males. Chi-square analysis indicated no significant differences at the .05 level between cities and non-cities in the proportion of males and females who received bursaries from these jurisdictions.

Bursary Recipients as a Proportion of All Education Students

Table VI outlines the proportion of Education students who were bursary recipients in 1966-67. The students were classed according to university year (first, second, etc.). Student population data were obtained from the Student Record Office of the Faculty of Education,

University of Alberta (Edmonton). Enrolment data from this source enumerated the full time students of education from all teacher training faculties as of October 1, 1966.

The proportion of bursary recipients. Table VI shows that approximately one out of every five Alberta education students registered for first or second year university training in 1966-67 was the recipient of a school board bursary. The exact figures indicated that 19.5 per cent first year and 18.9 per cent second year students were bursary recipients. The proportion of recipients in third and fourth year university in 1966-67 was 9.2 and 7.8 per cent respectively, while 3.3 per cent of graduate students in education and 4.0 per cent of those students pursuing a Bachelor of Education degree after an approved degree from another Faculty were recipients of school board bursaries. It should be noted that successful completion of a two year teacher training course in Alberta in 1966-67 was sufficient prerequisite for certification to teach. In total, 14.4 per cent (almost one in seven) of all full time students registered in Faculties of Education in Alberta were recipients of school board bursaries in 1966-67. Chi-square analysis indicated that a significant relationship existed between year of registration and the proportion of students with bursaries.

TABLE VI

BURSARY RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF THE FULL TIME
EDUCATION STUDENT POPULATION IN ALBERTA 1966-67

University Year	No. of Education Students	No. of Students with Bursaries	Per Cent with Bursaries
First	1,391	272	19.5
Second	1,445	273	18.9
Third	846	78	9.2
Fourth	562	44	7.8
Graduate Students	302	10	3.3
B. Ed. After Approved Degree	227	9	4.0
Total Education Students	4,773	686*	14.4

* - Four of the 690 bursary recipients could not be identified as to university year.

Note: Only full time students enumerated. "Partials", "specials", and "summer session" students not included.

Distribution of Bursary Recipients

In addition to a review of the number and proportions of bursary recipients in the various university years, the data were further analyzed to obtain the distribution of bursaries by sex and by city and non-city school jurisdictions. The results of this analysis are portrayed in Table VII.

TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION BY UNIVERSITY YEAR AND BY SEX OF 1966-67 CITY AND NON-CITY
BURSARY RECIPIENTS

(Distribution figures are expressed as a per cent of N. N=686 recipients)

University Year*	City Bursary Recipients		Non-City Bursary Recipients		Total Recipients
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
First	1.2	4.5	10.8	23.2	39.7
Second	6.0	6.2	10.3	17.3	39.8
Third	0.9	0.6	6.4	3.5	11.4
Fourth	0.8	0	4.3	1.3	6.4
Post. Grad.	0.9	0	0.4	0	1.3
After Another Degree	1.2	0.2	0	0	1.4
Total Percent	11	11.5	32.2	45.3	100.0

* - As given in data from Students Assistance Board.

Note: This table may be read as follows: 1.2 per cent of 1966-67 bursary recipients were males who had received bursaries from city boards.

Statistics derived from Table VII. The preponderance of bursary recipients in the first two years of university training is evident from Table VII. When the percentage of the bursary recipients of both sexes in first and second year university are combined (39.7 per cent plus 39.8 per cent), the resulting total of 79.5 per cent accounts for almost four-fifths of the entire group of recipients. This sub-group (79.5 per cent of all recipients) was largely composed of females (51.2 per cent of all recipients) with a lesser proportion of males (28.3 per cent of all recipients) making up the remainder. However, for those recipients registered in third year university or beyond, the proportion of males was nearly twice that of females. Through calculations using the data in Table VII, it may be noted that 14.9 per cent of all bursary recipients were males who had registered in third year university or beyond while only 8.6 per cent of all recipients were females who fitted in this category.

Financial Details of 1966-67 Bursaries

Analysis of the distribution of school board bursaries in 1966-67 was followed by a survey of related financial facts. The average values of the bursaries granted by the various Alberta school jurisdictions, plus the total costs of the different programs, were computed from the data obtained from the Students Assistance Board and the Department of Vocational and Industrial Training,

Faculty of Education, University of Alberta (Edmonton).
The results are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

TOTAL AND AVERAGE VALUES OF 690 BURSARIES GRANTED BY
ALBERTA SCHOOL JURISDICTIONS IN 1966-67

School Jurisdiction	Number of Bursaries Granted	Total Value	Average Value Per Bursary
City Districts	137	\$ 325,400	\$ 2,375
Non-Cities			
Counties	308	141,200	360
Divisions	237	113,400	362
Others*	8	11,800	1,475
Total Non-City	553	266,400	482
Grand Total	690	591,800	857

* - Non-divisional districts and independent towns.

Average values of bursaries. Table VIII indicated that the bursaries granted by cities in 1966-67 had an average value of \$2,375 each. This was the highest average value in Alberta. In descending order of average value were: non-divisional districts and independent towns (\$1,475); school divisions (\$362); and counties (\$360). In total, non-city jurisdictions granted bursaries with a mean value of \$482 while the mean for the entire 690 bursaries granted in Alberta in 1966-67 was \$857 per bursary.

The values noted in Table VIII did not differentiate between vocational and non-vocational bursaries. Non-vocational bursaries it may be recalled, were wholly financed by local boards and were normally granted to students proceeding directly from high school to university. Table IX was prepared to present the total and average values of non-vocational bursaries. Vocational bursaries have not been analyzed separately because their values were standardized at \$3,000 and \$5,000 depending on whether or not a recipient supported individuals other than himself.

TABLE IX

TOTAL AND MEAN VALUES OF 1966-67 NON-VOCATIONAL
BURSARIES GRANTED BY ALBERTA SCHOOL BOARDS

School Jurisdiction	Number Granted	Total Value	Mean Value*
City Boards	68	\$ 20,400	\$ 300
Non-city Boards	542	217,400	401
All Jurisdictions	610	237,800	389

* - To nearest whole dollar

The values expressed in Table IX illustrate a financial point of some interest. At a mean value of \$401, the non-vocational bursaries granted by non-city boards in 1966-67 exceeded the mean value of city non-vocational bursaries by \$101. Further, the mean value

of city non-vocational bursaries in 1966-67 was \$89 below the Alberta provincial mean of \$389.

Cost of bursaries to boards. As indicated in Table VIII, the 690 school board bursaries granted in Alberta in 1966-67 had a total value of over one-half a million dollars (\$591,800). City school districts granted 137 bursaries (19.8 per cent of the 690 grand total) with a face value of \$325,400 or 55.0 per cent of the total value of all bursaries. The combined boards of non-city areas of Alberta granted 553 bursaries (80.2 per cent of the grand total) in 1966-67. These bursaries had a value of \$166,400 or 45.0 per cent of the total value of all bursaries. It should not be interpreted that the costs noted in Table VII were those actually borne by local boards. It may be recalled that local boards contributed only \$600 and \$1,000 respectively of the \$3,000 and \$5,000 vocational bursaries. Table X portrays the actual costs to local school boards of the 690 bursaries granted in 1966-67.

Table X shows that the actual cost to city boards for the 137 bursaries granted in 1966-67 was \$81,400. The 553 bursaries issued by non-city jurisdictions in the same period meant an actual expenditure to these boards of \$224,800. On the basis of these figures, the proportion of bursaries obtained for costs actually borne were more evenly balanced between city and non-city boards. City

TABLE X

ACTUAL COST OF BURSARIES TO CITY AND NON-CITY
SCHOOL BOARDS 1966-67

Jurisdiction	Number of Bursaries	Actual Cost to Boards	Average Cost Per Bursary
City Boards	137	\$ 81,400	\$ 594
Non-City Boards	553	224,800	406
Total Boards	690	306,200	444

Note: (1) Actual costs for Table IX were obtained by subtracting the federal-provincial contribution towards vocational bursaries from the "Total Values" shown in Table VIII.

(2) Average costs are to the nearest whole dollar.

boards granted 19.8 per cent of the 1966-67 bursaries (137 out of 690) for an expenditure of 27.7 per cent of the total cost of all bursaries (\$89,400 of \$306,200). Non-city boards obtained 80.2 per cent of the 1966-67 bursaries for an expenditure of 72.3 per cent of the total cost of all bursaries.

As noted in Table X, the average actual expenditure of city boards for both vocational and non-vocational bursaries was \$594. This amount exceeded by \$188 the \$406 average expenditure per bursary required of non-city boards. Further analysis of the actual costs incurred in granting non-vocational bursaries is reported in Table XI.

TABLE XI

RANGE, MEAN, AND MEDIAN VALUES OF NON-VOCATIONAL
SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES 1966-67

Jurisdiction	Range	Median	Mean
City Boards	\$ 150 - 1,000	\$ 200	\$ 300
Non-City Boards	\$ 100 - 1,600	\$ 400	\$ 401

Comments on Table XI. City non-vocational bursaries in 1966-67 ranged in value from \$150 to \$1,000. The latter value (\$1,000) was provided to assist experienced teachers in "specialty" training such as library science. These relatively expensive bursaries were granted in sufficient quantity to create the difference between a mean value of \$300 and a median value of \$200. The majority of city bursaries in the non-vocational category were \$250 or less in value. Non-city, non-vocational bursaries ranged in value from a low of \$100 to a high of \$1,600. Mean and median values were \$401 and \$400 respectively. Not shown in Table XI, but obtained from the data, was the fact that the majority of non-city, non-vocational bursaries granted in 1966-67 ranged between \$350 and \$450 in value.

III. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Extent of the practice in Canada. School board bursaries were offered in three Canadian provinces (Alberta,

Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia) in 1966-67. The practice was limited to a few boards in Nova Scotia but apparently was more extensive in Saskatchewan. In Alberta over 80 per cent of counties and school divisions and over 75 per cent of city public school systems operated bursary programs in 1966-67. Three of fourteen Alberta towns which functioned as independent school jurisdictions and three of ten city separate systems had bursary programs in the same year.

Bursaries in Alberta: 1961-62 to 1965-66. Throughout the five year period of 1961-62 to 1965-66 a total of 1,860 school board bursaries (at a cost of \$1,106,360) were reported as having been offered by school boards to teacher trainees. The mean value of bursaries offered by city boards for this five year period was \$1,690, while the mean value of non-city bursaries stood at \$355. The extensive practice by city boards of issuing vocational bursaries, which by 1965-66 had reached values of up to \$5,000 each, was a major factor in accounting for the difference in city and non-city mean values of bursaries in this period. These vocational bursaries, jointly financed from federal, provincial, and local school board coffers, came into being in response to the need for vocational instructors in the technical training area of education which had expanded dramatically throughout the five year period under review.

Bursaries in Alberta: 1966-67

Numerical accounting. A total of 690 bursaries was reported granted by school jurisdictions in 1966-67. Of this number, 137 were granted by city boards and 553 by non-city boards. Vocational bursaries made up 50.3 per cent of city bursaries but accounted for only 1.9 per cent of those issued by non-city boards.

Proportion of teacher trainees with bursaries. One of every seven full time Alberta teacher trainees was the recipient of a school board bursary in 1966-67. However, the proportions were not evenly distributed throughout the university years. Approximately one in every five students in first and second year training in the Faculties of Education in Alberta held a school board bursary while in third and fourth year combined the proportion fell to just under one student in twelve. Of a total 529 students in graduate work in Education, or who were taking teacher training after a different degree, 19 held school board bursaries. The total proportion of students in these areas with bursaries was approximately one in twenty-eight.

Financial details. In 1966-67 the average value of city bursaries was \$2,375 each, and for non-cities, \$482. However, the average actual cost per bursary (federal and provincial contributions towards vocational bursaries set aside) was \$594 for cities and \$406 for non-cities.

In regard to non-vocational bursaries issued to students proceeding from high school to university the mean value of those offered by non-city jurisdictions was \$401 which was substantially higher than the mean value of non-vocational city bursaries at \$300. The median values of non-vocational bursaries granted by cities (\$200) was just one-half the median value of bursaries offered by non-city boards (\$400). The total value of all school board bursaries reported as granted in Alberta for the school year 1966-67 was \$591,800. The actual cost of these bursaries to the participating board totalled \$306,200.

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT RECIPIENTS OF SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES

1966 - 67

One of the major tasks in this thesis was to examine school board bursaries from the point of view of the recipients. Chapter IV reports on the preparation of a questionnaire and the results obtained from its use in a survey of students who had received school board bursaries for the 1966-67 university school year.

I. OBTAINING THE DATA

The sample selected for study consisted of the students listed by the Students Assistance Board as 1966-67 school board bursary recipients who could be traced to the Edmonton campus of the University of Alberta. The names of 432 individuals appeared in both the lists prepared by the Students Assistance Board and in the Student Directory published by the Students' Union of The University of Alberta (Edmonton). Of this group, five students withdrew from university shortly after registration. Difficulty was experienced in tracing a number of the students who changed their place of residence but had neglected to inform the university authorities. Efforts to locate fourteen members of the sample were abandoned when, within one week of final examinations,

they had not made their new addresses known to the Registrar or to the Student Record Department. As a result, questionnaires were sent to a total of 413 students. The assumption was made that this sample was representative of the 690 teacher trainees throughout Alberta who were reported as school board bursary recipients in 1966-67.

The Questionnaire

A sample of the questionnaire which was sent to bursary recipients appears in Appendix B. The final format was prepared after a trial run with fifteen bursary recipients. Critical review by the writer's Faculty Advisor (Dr. H. T. Sparby), and by a research seminar of M. Ed. candidates in Educational Administration assisted in the development of the questionnaire.

Because the nature of the study was that of an inquiring type of survey, "forced choice" answers were generally avoided and a sizeable proportion of "open-ended" questions were included. In addition, where direct answers were called for, space was usually provided (along with an appropriate request) for any elaboration the respondent might wish to make.

A total of 359 completed questionnaires (87.0 per cent) were received from the original sample of 413 students to whom forms had been sent. The response to both the open-ended type of question and to the request for elaboration

where direct answers were called for was as gratifying as was the high percentage of returns. Virtually every respondent took the opportunity to express additional views. One and two pages of extra comment were not uncommon.

Identification of respondents. Each questionnaire was coded to permit precise identification of the area from which a respondent had received his bursary. The code was made obvious to allow the respondent the opportunity of removing the identification numeral if so desired. Sixty-one of the 359 respondents chose to remain anonymous. Initial statistical analysis of the 298 respondents who could be identified as to the areas from which their bursaries were received indicated that no significant differences existed between county and divisional recipients in regard to the replies to the questionnaire. As a consequence, it was decided to maintain the categorization of "City" and "Non-City" recipients established in Chapter III.

Sex of respondents. A total of 213 females (59.4 per cent) and 146 males (40.6 per cent) made up the 359 respondents. Distribution of the respondents, by sex and by area, was as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
City Recipients	14	30	44
Non-City	113	141	254

The total of sixty-one respondents who could not be traced to a specific area was made up of nineteen males and forty-two females. A Chi-square test of the respondents who could be identified as to the area from which they received their bursaries revealed no significant relationship between sex and the area (city or non-city) from which the bursaries were obtained.

Analysis of Data

Data obtained from the questionnaires were coded and transferred to IBM punch cards for ease of analysis. The cross-tabulation program (described in Chapter I) was used to obtain percentage distributions and chi-square tests of relationship or contingency.

It may be recalled from Chapter I that the .05 level of significance has been used throughout the thesis. Included in the cross-tabulation program were weights which indicated the direction of differences between distributions. For example, chi-square analysis indicated that at the .05 level of confidence a significant dependency existed between age groups and sex of the recipients. The weighting factor indicated that the males tended to be older than the female respondents.

II. RESULTS FROM SECTION ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

INFORMATION ABOUT RECIPIENTS

The first six questions of the format were concerned

with personal data related to bursary recipients. A brief summary of the results follows.

Sex, University Year, and Program of Studies

Questions were directed towards bursary recipients in regard to their sex, the university year in which they were registered, and the program of studies which they were taking. The results are in Table XII.

Respondents were included from all but the doctoral level of studies at the Faculty of Education (Edmonton). The majority of respondents, 73.0 per cent, were in the first and second year of university. The proportion of females dropped from 70.2 per cent of all respondents in first and second year to 32.1 per cent of the respondents registered in third year and beyond.

In regard to programs of study, the largest proportion of females, as might be expected, was in elementary education. However, chi-square tests of distribution indicated that among female recipients there was a significant relationship between the area from which the bursary was received and the program chosen. A higher proportion of non-city females than city females were registered in secondary education. No such dependency between area and program existed among male recipients.

Age of recipients. All but one respondent replied to a request for the age of the recipient as of receiving the bursary for the 1966-67 university year. Age ranged

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX, UNIVERSITY YEAR AND PROGRAM OF STUDIES

M = Male
F = Female

University Year	Program of Studies								Total (Both Sexes)
	Elementary		Secondary		Vocational		Other*		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
First	3	56	31	43	0	0	4	1	138
Second	6	53	28	29	4	3	1	0	124
Third	4	7	20	11	3	0	3	0	48
Fourth	1	0	16	8	3	0	1	0	29
B. Ed. After Approved Degree	10	0	0	0	4	0	2	2	18
M. Ed.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Total	24	116	95	91	14	3	13	3	359

* - "Others" included Industrial Arts, House Economics, Physical Education and Guidance Counselling.

from a low of sixteen to a high of forty-five years. The median age on receipt of the bursary was eighteen with a total of one hundred and forty-three respondents (39.9 per cent) in this category. The per cent of males and females who were in three different age categories was as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
19 and under	56.8	84.5
20 to 29	32.2	14.1
30 and over	11.0	1.4
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100.0	100.0

Chi-square analysis indicated, as previously noted, that a significant relationship did exist between age and sex. The proportion of males in the older age groups was substantially higher than that of females.

Were bursary recipients local graduates? All 359 respondents answered this particular question. Local graduates represented 76.8 per cent of all recipients while the remainder (23.2 per cent) had attained high school graduation in an area other than the one from which they had received a bursary. Chi-square analysis indicated that these proportions were independent of city or non-city jurisdictions offering bursaries.

III. RESULTS FROM SECTION TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: INFORMATION RECIPIENTS PROVIDED ABOUT BURSARIES

The remaining questions asked recipients to provide a variety of facts, opinions, and estimates concerning school board bursaries as they saw them. The remainder of the chapter is concerned with a tabulation and an analysis of the replies of bursary recipients to these questions.

Sources of Information About Bursaries

By far the larger proportion of respondents indicated that their source of information about bursaries was connected with their high school. "The school" was the reply given by 32.5 per cent of all respondents. A breakdown of the remaining sources, in order of proportion, resulted in the following distribution:

<u>Information Source</u>	<u>Per Cent Selecting This Source</u>
Principals and/or Teachers	27.8
Superintendents	12.0
Letters-circulars- advertisements	11.2
Board Members	9.2
Guidance Counsellors	4.2
Relatives	3.1

It may be argued that all sources indicated by students, with the exception of "Board Members" and

"Relatives" were connected with the high school of the bursary recipient. On this basis, 87.7 per cent of all sources named by recipients were related to the school.

Interviewing of Applicants

A total of 357 of the 359 respondents replied to the question, "Were you interviewed by someone before you were granted a bursary?" Nearly two-thirds of this number (64.8 per cent) replied in the negative. Of those who had been interviewed (a total of 126 students), 101 were interviewed by the superintendent or his assistant. The remaining twenty-five were interviewed by board members, secretary-treasurers, or personnel officers. In only two cases were principals identified as interviewers.

Contact With the Granting Board

It was noted in the preliminary trial run of the student questionnaire that some boards maintained regular liaison with their bursary recipients while others virtually ignored their charges. It was decided to attempt to determine whether or not the maintenance of relations between recipient and board affected certain attitudes and decisions made by students. Table XIII provides a display in per cent of school board recipient contact.

It may be noted in Table XIII that approximately 25 per cent of all respondents indicated that they had had no subsequent contact with their bursary board since

TABLE XIII

SCHOOL BOARD - RECIPIENT CONTACT AFTER BURSARY GRANTED

Type of Contact	Per Cent of Recipients
Personal	26.4
Mail	25.9
Personal and by Mail	22.6
Not Described	1.7
Nil	<u>23.4</u>
	100.0

Note: All 359 respondents answered this question.
 "Not Described" refers to instances in which students stated that contact was made but the method was not given.

receiving their bursary. Approximately 75 per cent of recipients had been in contact with their bursary board. Method of contact was almost equally divided among personal, mail, and combined personal and mail contact. The term "personal contact" used in Table XIII was used to describe contact which ranged from telephone calls from superintendents to the practice of one board of providing bursary students with a special banquet supper during the university term.

The relation of contact to other variables. Chi-square analysis disclosed that, in regard to four variables tested, there was no dependent relationship between the views expressed by students who had maintained contact with their bursary boards and with those who had not. The

variables tested were as follows:

- (1) decision to teach or not to teach for the board which granted the bursary;
- (2) decision as to whether or not to teach for the full term of the bursary commitment;
- (3) a positive or negative attitude toward bursaries;
- (4) whether or not there was a moral commitment to honor the teaching commitment of a bursary contract.

Analysis further indicated that the views expressed by students bore no relation to the different types of contact they received from their boards.

Number of Bursaries Received Versus The Teaching Commitment

Recipients were asked to state the number of bursaries they had received and the total years of teaching service to which they were now committed. Three students (all female from rural areas) had returned their bursary prior to receiving the questionnaire. The remaining 356 respondents indicated that they had received a total of 520 bursaries and were committed for a total of 698 years of teaching service. On the basis of this information the following averages were computed:

Number of bursaries per respondent	-	1.46
Commitment per bursary (years)	-	1.34
Commitment per recipient (years)	-	1.95

Respondents who stated that they had received more than two bursaries were not common. Only 2.4 per cent of the females had received three bursaries, none had received more than three. A total of 14.4 per cent of the males had three or more bursaries.

Questionnaire respondents reported the distribution of teaching commitment to bursaries received was as follows:

<u>Commitment Per Bursary</u>		<u>Per Cent of Respondents</u>
More than one year/ bursary	-	49.3
One year/bursary	-	46.5
Less than one year/ bursary	-	<u>4.2</u>
		100.0

The number of bursaries related to years of commitment was reported as ranging from a low of three bursaries for one year of teaching (a ratio of 1:.333) to a high of two bursaries for five years of service (a ratio of 1:2.5). A higher proportion of city bursaries required more than one year of service per bursary than did those from non-city school jurisdictions. Chi-square tests indicated that the relationship was significant at the .01 level of confidence. No relationship was apparent between city and non-city areas in regard to the number of bursaries granted per student. No student reported that he had returned a bursary from one board and accepted a bursary from another.

Decision on Taking Teacher Training

Does the availability of financial assistance through school board bursaries influence young men and women to take teacher training? This question is considered an important one but also one to which an objective reply is difficult to elicit. Rather than asking students whether or not they had decided to become teachers because financial assistance was available, the question was directed towards finding out when the decision in regard to taking teacher training had been made by the recipients. Had the decision been made before or after the students had become aware of the bursaries? A total 321 bursary recipients (89.4 per cent) indicated that their decision to take teacher training had been made before they had found out about bursaries. Thirty-four (9.5 per cent) indicated the decision was made after being aware of bursaries while four students (1.1 per cent) did not select either response but indicated their decision to take teacher training was influenced by the availability of bursaries.

Data From Non-Transfer Students

In preparing the questionnaire it was decided that certain information was desired of the students who had no other university experience except in the Faculty of Education. Of 359 respondents, 313 indicated that such was the case.

The following four questions were asked of these students:

- (1) Would you have entered university if you had not received a school board bursary?
- (2) What was your university entrance standing?
- (3) Did the school board indicate the years of training you should have prior to teaching?
- (4) Did you proceed directly from high school to university?

University entrance and school board bursaries.

A total of 311 of 313 students who had no university experience other than in the Faculty of Education responded to the four questions. Replies to the question of whether the students would have entered university if a bursary had not been received were:

	<u>Reply</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
(A)	Yes	265	85.5
(B)	No	3	0.7
(C)	Probably would	33	10.6
(D)	Probably would not	<u>10</u>	<u>3.2</u>
	Total	311	100.0

It may be noted from the previous tabulation that all but 14.5 per cent of the 311 respondents claimed that they would have attended university whether they had received a bursary or not. Less than one per cent (0.7 per cent) indicated that they would not have attended

university without the bursary.

University entrance standing. The university entrance standings of those who entered the Faculty of Education without any previous university training is summarized in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE STANDINGS AS REPORTED BY
1966-67 BURSARY RECIPIENTS WITH NO PRIOR
UNIVERSITY TRAINING

Range of Marks	Frequency	Per Cent
60 - 64	125	40.3
65 - 69	87	27.9
70 - 74	58	18.6
75 - 79	28	9.0
80 - 84	10	3.2
85 and above	3	1.0
Total	311	100.0

As may be derived from Table XIV, over two-thirds (68.2 per cent) of the respondents reported a university entrance standing of less than 70.0 per cent. Chi-square analysis was conducted in which recipients with a university entrance standing of 70 per cent or more were compared with those with a standing of less than 70 per cent in regard to

the following six points:

- (1) sex of recipients;
- (2) city and non-city recipients;
- (3) decision as to whether or not to teach for the board which granted the bursary;
- (4) decision as to whether or not to teach for the full term of the bursary commitment;
- (5) positive or negative attitude towards bursaries; and
- (6) whether or not there was a moral commitment to fulfill a bursary contract.

Chi-square analysis failed to reveal a single instance in which the distribution of responses in the foregoing six areas was contingent upon university entrance standing dichotomized as above or below 70 per cent.

Did the school boards indicate years of training?
Slightly over seven-tenths (70.7 per cent) of the 311 respondents stated that school boards had not indicated the number of years of training they should have. However, seventy-six individuals (24.4 per cent) stated that their board felt they should have two years teacher training (the minimum required in Alberta 1966-67 for certification), 2.3 per cent indicated three years, the same proportion (2.3 per cent) indicated four years, while 0.3 per cent (one respondent) did not state the number of years indicated by the board. Chi-square analysis indicated no significant

dependency between whether or not years of training were indicated and city and non-city jurisdictions.

Years removed from high school. Of the 311 respondents who had no university training prior to entering the Faculty of Education, 269 had gone directly from high school to university. Twenty of the remaining forty-two respondents had remained out of school for a single year. For the rest, the hiatus between high school and university ranged from two to a maximum of twenty-seven years.

Decision Regarding Years of Training

All recipients were asked to indicate the number of years of training they planned to complete before starting to teach. The replies from 358 respondents were as follows:

<u>Years of Training</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Two	139	38.8
Three	80	22.3
Four (Degree)	111	31.0
B. Ed. (After a Degree)	5	1.5
Post Graduate Work	11	3.1
Undecided	<u>12</u>	<u>3.3</u>
	358	100.0

The 139 students who indicated that they planned to teach after two years of training were asked to state

whether this decision was reached on their own or made because their bursary agreement so required. A total of thirty-six students (25.9 per cent) replied that their decision reflected the bursary requirement, the remainder said they made their decision on their own volition.

It may be recalled that seventy-six students who had no university training prior to entering the Faculty of Education stated that their bursary board had indicated they should have two years of university training before teaching. Twenty-two of this number were among those who planned to teach after two years because of contractual requirement. Of the remainder, thirty stated that their decision to teach after two years was their own idea as well as a board stipulation, while twenty-four had decided on further training beyond two years despite (apparently) the wishes of their board.

Bursary Recipients and The Teaching Commitment

Bursary recipients were asked to declare whether or not they planned on actually teaching for the school board which had granted them their 1966-67 bursary. All 359 respondents completed the question. A total of 316 respondents (88.0 per cent) declared that they planned to teach for the board which had granted them a bursary. Forty-three students (thirteen males, thirty females) stated that they were not planning to teach for their bursary board. Negative replies represented 12.0 per cent

of all respondents. Chi-square tests indicated that there was no significant relationship between the factors of sex or the area from which the bursary was received and the decision to teach or not to teach for the bursary board. The number of bursaries received by a student had no significant relationship to the teaching decision. Whether or not a recipient was interviewed by a board, maintained contact with a board, or had a low or high university entrance standing also appeared to have no significant relationship to his decision to honor the teaching commitment. A higher proportion of older recipients indicated that they would teach for their board than did young recipients but again the relationship was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Reasons given for not teaching for the bursary board. Fourteen of the thirty females who had decided not to teach for the board which had granted them their 1966-67 bursary supplied a reason for their decision. Nine of the fourteen reasons given could be categorized under "marriage plans". The five other reasons which female students gave were all of an individual and somewhat personal nature.

Six of the thirteen males who had decided against teaching for their bursary board stated a reason for their decision. "Wish to continue education", was the reason given by three males. Another stated that it would be

unlikely that he would be able to teach his specialty in his home area. The reasons given by the remaining two could best be subsumed under the heading of "Personal".

Fulfillment of the teaching commitment. The 316 recipients who had indicated that they planned to teach for the board were asked to select one of four choices as an answer to the question, "Do you plan to teach for the full term of your commitment?" Replies to this question are summarized in Table XV.

TABLE XV

WILL THOSE WHO PLAN TO TEACH FOR THEIR BURSARY
BOARD COMPLETE THE FULL COMMITMENT?

Teach Full Commitment?	Males	Females	Total	Per Cent
(A) Yes	94	115	209	67.0
(B) Probably Will	33	41	74	23.7
(C) Probably Will Not	3	16	19	6.1
(D) No	2	8	10	3.2
Total	132	180	312	100.0

Note: 3 females and 1 male did not reply to the question.
N = 312.

Approximately two-thirds (67.0 per cent) of the 312 recipients who said they would teach for their bursary board selected "Yes" as their response to the question of completing the full term of the commitment. Those who selected "Probably Will" accounted for 23.7 per cent. "Probably Will Not" was indicated by 6.1 per cent while "No" was the reply of 3.2 per cent.

A total of 103 students (33.0 per cent of the 312 respondents in this group) did not select a definite "Yes" to the question of completing all the teaching required by their bursary contracts. These individuals were categorized as "doubtful" in regard to the teaching commitment.

Chi-square analysis. In regard to the question of completing the teaching commitment, chi-square analysis showed no significant relationship between:

- (1) the sexes;
- (2) city and non-city recipients;
- (3) those interviewed and those not interviewed;
- (4) those who maintained contact with the bursary board and those who did not; and
- (5) between those of high or low university entrance standing.

A higher percentage of recipients in their "twenties" and "thirties" indicated they intended to complete the entire commitment than did the proportion of teenage recipients.

However, a chi-square of 5.76 with two degrees of freedom was just under the score of 5.99 required for significance at the .05 level. The single instance in which a significant relationship did appear was in regard to the number of bursaries received. A larger proportion of students who decided to teach for the full commitment had received more than two bursaries than those students who did not. However, only approximately 5.0 per cent of all recipients had received more than two bursaries.

Reasons for not completing the commitment. Of the 103 students who were "Doubtful" as to completing the teaching commitment, 47 provided a reason as to why the contract terms might not be met. The reasons expressed were as follows:

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Marriage plans	2	20
Prefer urban center	1	2
Continue studies	4	2
Prefer a different area	4	6
Personal reasons (not specified)	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	12	32

"Marriage plans" and a preference for a different area in which to work were the two main reasons given by those not planning to complete the teaching commitment.

Recipients of doubtful value. The combined totals

of the 43 students who declared that they would not teach at all for their bursary board plus the 103 respondents classed as "doubtful" in regard to completing the teaching commitment came to a grand total of 146 respondents. This number represented 40.7 per cent of all 359 respondents. This combined group, now labelled "Of Doubtful Value to a Board", consisted of fifty-one males and ninety-five females. The proportions of females and younger students were higher in the "Doubtful Value" group than in the total group consisting of all respondents. However, chi-square tests indicated that scores for the variables of age and sex approached, but did not reach, values of significant relationship in regard to membership in the "Doubtful Value" group.

Choice of Area in Which to Start Teaching

Would bursary recipients choose to start in the area to which they were now committed if they had a free choice of where they wished to teach in Alberta? The questionnaire called for a "Yes" or "No" reply with a space provided for those who wished to elaborate on their answer. The replies of the 350 students who answered the question were as follows:

Would you choose to start where now committed?

<u>Reply</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Yes	217
No	117
Undecided	<u>16</u>
Total	350

The 217 individuals who indicated that, given a free choice, they would start in the area to which they were now committed represented 62.0 per cent of the 350 respondents to the question. Those who answered "No", or were undecided, accounted for the remaining 38.0 per cent. Chi-square analysis indicated no significant relationship between males and females nor among age groups in response to this question. However, the choice in regard to starting in a home area was seen to be dependent upon the area from which the bursary was received. A higher proportion of non-city than city recipients indicated they would not choose to start in their own area.

Ninety-eight of the 133 respondents who indicated either "No" or "Undecided" to the question of choosing to start in the bursary area supplied a reason for their decision. The most frequently expressed reasons, in order, were:

- (1) Interested in a change of scene;
- (2) Felt too well known in local area to be an effective teacher;

- (3) Wished to be near an urban center or close to a university.

A total of 125 individuals gave reasons for their affirmative decision in regard to whether or not, under a free choice condition, they would choose to start their teaching career in the jurisdiction which had granted their present bursary. In order of frequency the three most commonly expressed reasons were:

- (1) Familiarity with the local area;
- (2) Desire to live at home;
- (3) Satisfied with local teaching situation.

Second Thoughts About Taking a Bursary

In an effort to find out if the 1966-67 bursary recipients had become disenchanted with their bursary board or exhibited satisfaction or dissatisfaction with being a "bursary student", the questionnaire asked recipients whether or not, if they had it to do all over again, would they accept a bursary from their present board? After being given the opportunity to indicate "Yes" or "No" to the previous question, students were then asked if they would accept a bursary from another school board. The tabulation of the responses to these dual questions has been outlined in Table XVI.

As may be noted from Table XVI, a total of 249 recipients (71.7 per cent of the respondents to the question) would accept a bursary from their present board

TABLE XVI

IF DECISION COULD BE MADE AGAIN, WOULD STUDENTS TAKE
A BURSARY FROM: THE SAME BOARD? A DIFFERENT BOARD?

Take Bursary from Same Board?	Take Bursary from a Different Board?	
	Yes	No
Yes (249)	129	120
No (101)	36	65

"Undecided", or failed to complete the question = 9.
N = 350.

Note: "Probably Would" or "Probably Would Not" were
classed as "Yes" or "No" respectively. A
total of 22 respondents were "Probables".

if they were given the opportunity to repeat the decision. Of these 249 individuals, 129 would also accept a bursary from another board while 120 would not. A total of 101 students (28.2 per cent) would not accept a bursary from their present board. Of these students thirty-six were willing to take a bursary from another board. A total of sixty-five respondents (18.6 per cent) were apparently entirely disenchanted with bursaries and, if they could make the choice again, would neither take a bursary from their present board or from any other.

Explanations. Of the 350 individuals who replied to the question, 150 chose to express a point of view as

to why they would or would not accept a bursary from their own or from another board. Reasons which were given with a frequency of five or more times are summarized in the following analysis. Categories are noted in descending order of magnitude.

Category 1: Would take a bursary from either present board or from another.

(129 respondents, 41 reasons given)

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
"The money is what matters"	37
Others	$\frac{4}{41}$

Category 2: Would take a bursary from own board but not from another.

(120 respondents, 33 reasons given)

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Wish to work in familiar area	14
Satisfied with own board	12
Others	$\frac{7}{33}$

Category 3: Would not take a bursary again from any board.

(65 respondents, 47 reasons given)

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Resented commitment	41
Others	$\frac{6}{47}$

Category 4: Would not take a bursary from present board but would accept one from another.

(36 respondents, 24 reasons)

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Other boards offer higher value of bursary	11
Would take a bursary from a city	7
Others	<u>6</u> 24

The Question of Moral Commitment

One of the philosophical unknowns which this thesis attempted to probe was the question of whether or not recipients of school board bursaries felt that they were morally bound to complete the teaching commitment required in a bursary contract. An indirect approach was used to survey this issue. A hypothetical situation, posed in the questionnaire, described a student who held a bursary from school board "X" but wished to teach for school board "Y". Students were then asked the question: "If the student paid back the full amount of his bursary, plus interest, would he then be free of any obligation to school board "X"?

Questionnaire recipients were asked to indicate a "Yes" or "No" and to explain their choice if they so desired. All but two of the respondents replied to this particular question. A summary of the 357 replies follows:

Does repayment free a recipient of further obligations to a board?

<u>Reply</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Yes	284	79.6
No	71	19.9
Undecided	<u>2</u>	<u>0.5</u>
Total	357	100.0

Student explanations. Almost four-fifths of all respondents (79.6 per cent) selected "Yes" as the answer to the question of whether or not repayment of a bursary freed a recipient from any further obligation. Comments of an explanatory nature were received from 69 of the 284 individuals who took this position. The explanations were as follows:

<u>Explanations</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Student technically free but the procedure not fair to the board	42
Only a monetary obligation was involved	<u>27</u> 69

Seventy-one respondents (19.4 per cent) selected "No" to the question of whether or not repayment freed the hypothetical student from further obligation to a board. Forty-two who made this choice provided a reason. Their replies were summarized as follows:

<u>Explanations</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
The student has a moral obligation to the board	27
Professional ethics would be violated	3
A commitment exists (type not specified)	<u>12</u>
	42

Distribution patterns. Analysis disclosed that a higher proportion of the following three categories of bursary recipients indicated that repayment did not free a recipient of all obligations than was indicated by other categories in their particular group. In each case the dependency between category and response was significant. The categories were:

- (1) Recipients aged thirty and over versus those younger than thirty;
- (2) Recipients who had transferred to Education from another faculty versus those who had no prior university training;
- (3) Vocational students as opposed to students in other programs.

It may be noted that in all the above instances the factor of age, with concomitant experience, may be evident in those categories of students in which a higher proportion of individuals felt a bursary recipient had more than a financial obligation to a school board.

Further chi-square testing in regard to a student's

obligation to a board indicated no dependency of significance in the distribution of answers supplied by the following categories of respondents:

- (1) Males and females;
- (2) Recipients of city and non-city bursaries;
- (3) Those who received later contact from their board versus those who did not;
- (4) Students with a university entrance standing of 70 per cent or above and those with a standing of less than 70 per cent;
- (5) Students with a single bursary and those who had received more than one.

Student Opinion as to a Reasonable Bursary

Recipients of bursaries were asked to state what they thought would be a reasonable bursary as far as both students and school boards would be concerned. The range in values indicated by respondents was from a low of \$200 for a one year teaching commitment to a high of \$5,000 for a two year commitment. In both these extremes the values which were expressed were those of the bursaries presently held by these particular respondents.

Nearly four out of five respondents (78.8 per cent) selected a bursary value of between \$300 and \$550. The most frequently stated combination of bursary value and teaching commitment (which also proved to be the median for the sample) was a \$500 bursary for a one year teaching

commitment. This value may be compared with the non-vocational bursaries of 1966-67 from cities and non-cities which had mean values of \$300 and \$401 respectively. (Table IX, page 42).

Bursary Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages. A total of 352 respondents replied to an open-ended request to list the advantages of school board bursaries. These respondents listed a total of 588 advantages. Replies categorized under the heading "financial assistance" were listed 352 times and constituted the first choice of 78.0 per cent of the respondents to this question. "Assurance of a job" described the type of advantage listed a total of 211 times and selected as the first choice of 17.0 per cent of the respondents. All other advantages which were stated constituted a small minority of the total number listed. This small group (25 of 588 replies) included:

- (1) bursaries lead to internship;
- (2) the area is familiar;
- (3) bursaries are "free money".

Four individuals stated that they could see no advantage to a student in having a school board bursary.

Disadvantages. A total of 328 students listed 436 disadvantages to having a bursary. As was the case in the "advantages" two primary points arose plus a scattering of

other comments. The largest single objection to having a bursary was seen by recipients as being "tied down" to a teaching commitment. This point was raised 290 times and was listed first by 86.4 per cent of those who responded to the question. The second point, listed a total of forty-six times, was the feeling that a bursary recipient had no bargaining power as to where and what he was to teach. Many students who listed this type of a disadvantage were apparently convinced that bursary students were almost invariably sent to the least desirable areas in a school jurisdiction. A third disadvantage, which was listed by 8.5 per cent of respondents, was the belief that bursaries cut short educational advancement. "Bursaries hinder kids from completing their degree", was typical of replies in this category.

Disadvantages which were listed five or less times each included:

- (1) being in debt;
- (2) a belief that having a bursary reduced the amount of money which could be borrowed through the Students Assistance Board (a correct conclusion); and
- (3) bursaries were too easily obtained and regarded too lightly.

A total of five students stated that they could see no disadvantages to having a bursary.

Final commentary. The last request made of recipients of the questionnaire was for any final comments which they would like to make about school board bursaries. The majority of respondents had already provided additional commentary throughout the paper. Sixty individuals added comments in the last section. Of these statements, twenty-three expressed strong support of bursary programs and were classed as having a "positive attitude" towards bursaries. The following are typical quotations taken verbatim from this group:

"They are really great. It amount to free money."

"Bursaries help the teaching shortage and provide financial assistance."

Twenty-one of the sixty additional comments strongly opposed bursary programs and were classed as expressing a "negative attitude" towards bursaries. Some typical comments were:

"It's ridiculous to be committed to teach three years for \$600."

"Bursaries are purely a means of acquiring teachers, good or bad. People shouldn't have to be lured into a profession."

"Many students are unsuited to education.
They are here only because of the bursary."

Of the seventeen remaining comments (from the original sixty), ten expressed the idea that the recipients were unaware of other possibilities when they signed up for a bursary from their own area. Other comments ranged from

expressions that bursaries should be uniform throughout the province to seeing a need for more contact between a board and its bursary students.

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter IV was devoted to a report on and an analysis of a questionnaire sent to 413 students on the Edmonton campus of the University of Alberta who had received school board bursaries for the 1966-67 university year. A total of 359 questionnaires (87.0 per cent) were completed and returned by the bursary recipients.

Respondents

The respondents consisted of 213 females and 146 males. While the majority of each sex was in their "teens", the proportion of males twenty years or over was higher than females. The relationship between sex and age groups was significant. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents had graduated from the area which had granted them a bursary. Over 85 per cent of respondents had found out about bursaries through avenues associated with their high schools. However, 90 per cent of those who had no university training prior to entering the Faculty of Education (i.e., those who were not transfers from another faculty) said they became aware of school board bursaries after they had decided to take teacher training.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents said that they had never been interviewed in connection with their bursary application. Just under three-fourths of respondents had contact with their bursary board since receiving their 1966-67 bursary. Fifty per cent reported personal contact. However, neither the factor of being interviewed nor that of having later contact with the bursary board was found (by chi-square tests) to be related to decisions in regard to teaching for the bursary board, honoring the full commitment or in having a positive or negative attitude toward bursaries.

Number of Bursaries

Students with more than two bursaries were not common (less than five per cent of all respondents). The average number of bursaries received was 1.46 per student with an average teaching commitment per recipient of 1.95 years. The number of bursaries received was found to be related to sex. Males had received more bursaries per person than had females. Indeed, not a single female reported that she had received four bursaries from a school board.

A total of 312 students replied to questions directed at those who had no prior university training before entering the Faculty of Education. Less than one per cent (0.7) of these individuals stated that in effect the bursary which they received definitely permitted university

attendance. The large majority (85.5 per cent) said they would have entered university regardless of the bursary. The remainder (13.8 per cent) were "probables".

Approximately 30 per cent of those students with no university training prior to entering the Faculty of Education stated that their bursary board had indicated the number of years of teacher training they should have. Of those who had some direction, two years was cited in the large majority of cases. One hundred and thirty-nine of the 359 respondents stated that they had decided to teach after two years of training. Thirty-six students (9.8 per cent) said that they intended to teach after two years of training (the minimum required for certification) because their bursary contract required them to do so.

Bursary Recipients and The Teaching Commitment

Eighty-eight per cent of all students stated that they intended to teach for the board which had granted them a bursary; 12.0 per cent said they did not. In regard to the question of teaching for the bursary board, chi-square analysis revealed no significant relationship in responses among categories associated with the following variables:

- (1) sex;
- (2) university entrance standing;
- (3) number of bursaries received;

- (4) school board-recipient contact;
- (5) interview status;
- (6) age; and
- (7) area from which bursary received.

Almost exactly two-thirds of those who declared that they would teach for their bursary board also indicated that they planned to teach for the entire commitment. Chi-square tests indicated that a significant relationship existed between students with more than two bursaries and the decision to teach for the full commitment.

The combined numbers of those who would not teach for their board plus those who did not answer "Yes" to the question of completing the full teaching commitment totalled 146 students. This number, labelled "Of Doubtful Value to a Board", represented 40.7 per cent of the respondents. A higher proportion of this group was female teenagers than the original sample. "Marriage" was the primary reason given by females, and "Interest in another area" and "Wish to continue education" the major reasons given by males who took positions which led them to be classed as "Of Doubtful Value to a Board".

The majority of students (62.0 per cent) indicated that they were content to start their teaching careers in the areas to which they were committed by their bursary contracts. A significant relationship was seen to exist

between dissatisfaction with starting in the bursary area and possession of a non-city bursary.

Over one-third (36.8 per cent of respondents stated that, given a second chance, they would take a bursary from their own board or from another. "Financial assistance" was the primary reason cited for this decision. Those who would take a bursary only from their present board indicated that they were familiar with the local area or were satisfied with their present bursary board. Just under one bursary recipient in five (18.6 per cent) declared that, given a second chance, they would not take a bursary from any board. The dominant reason given was an objection to being committed to a particular board. Approximately one in ten recipients would not again take a bursary from the present board but would accept a bursary from a city or from a board which offered a financially more attractive bursary.

Moral Commitment

Bursary recipients were asked to judge whether or not (in a hypothetical situation) repayment of a bursary would free a student from any further obligations to the granting board. Nearly four-fifths of the respondents were of the opinion that repayment did free the student. Slightly over 20 per cent of the respondents had some reservations. However only thirty (8.4 per cent) of all respondents specifically mentioned that moral or ethical

obligations were involved. Higher proportions of respondents over thirty years of age, those who had transferred to Education from another faculty, and students in the vocational program, were included among those unwilling to agree that financial repayment freed a bursary recipient of all obligations.

A Reasonable Bursary

The bursary value most commonly agreed upon by respondents was a \$500 bursary for a year of teaching commitment. This value was approximately \$200 more than the 1966-67 mean value of non-vocational bursaries offered by cities and \$100 more than the same type of bursary offered by non-city jurisdictions. The single year of teaching commitment per bursary was one-third of a year less than the average commitment per bursary of the 1966-67 school year.

Advantages and Disadvantages: Positive and Negative Reactions

Financial assistance was listed as an advantage by 352 of 359 recipients. Assurance of a job after training was completed was seen as a second major advantage. The teaching commitment was most frequently regarded as the primary objection to having a bursary. A lack of bargaining power with the board in regard to placement (school and grade) was second among the disadvantages listed. Listed third as a disadvantage

was the belief that bursaries limited the years of education which a recipient could take before he was required to teach. In final comments supplied by sixty respondents, bursaries were strongly supported by twenty-three students. Strong condemnation was provided by twenty-one of the respondents. These numbers represented 6.4 and 5.8 per cent respectively of all respondents to the questionnaire.

CHAPTER V

SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES

In the original design of the thesis it was considered essential that certain data, opinions, and philosophies pertinent to the subject should be surveyed as close to the source of school board bursaries as possible. Provincially and locally appointed superintendents of schools appeared to be the logical personnel from whom to request information. Chapter V reports on the methods used and the results obtained in a survey directed at Alberta school superintendents.

I. OBTAINING THE DATA

Seventy-nine superintendents were listed by name and by jurisdiction in a circular prepared by the Alberta Department of Education and published in September, 1966. Twenty of these superintendents were "locally appointed", while the remainder were appointees of the Department of Education. The entire group was selected as the sample to be surveyed. In the case of large city systems, information concerning bursaries was requested of Directors of Personnel. It was felt that these administrative officers would be more immediately concerned with bursaries than would the superintendents. The term "superintendent" as used throughout this chapter includes such personnel.

The Questionnaire

It was decided that collection of data should be made by questionnaire. The format prepared for superintendents was designed to obtain information which in some cases would complement and in other instances be comparable with, data obtained from student recipients of bursaries. Certain questions were asked which were appropriate only to administrators while others were similar to those asked of students.

The writer's faculty advisor, Dr. H. T. Sparby, plus four former superintendents, reviewed and criticized intermediate and final drafts of the questionnaire. Copies of the final edition were surveyed by the Chief Superintendent of The Department of Education (Alberta), who gave his consent to the distribution of questionnaires to provincially appointed superintendents.

The questionnaire was divided into two separate parts. One part was directed exclusively at superintendents in whose jurisdictions school board bursary programs were operated in 1966-67. The other part was to be answered solely by those superintendents in areas which did not operate a bursary program in 1966-67. That part of the questionnaire directed at superintendents in whose jurisdictions school board bursary programs had been operative consisted of three distinct sections. These sections were:

- (1) a request for copies of bursary contractual,

information, and application forms;

(2) questions related to the concrete details of the local bursary program; and

(3) requests for the opinions of superintendents on a variety of matters concerning bursaries.

That part of the questionnaire reserved for superintendents of school jurisdictions which did not operate bursary programs in 1966-67 asked superintendents to explain why bursary programs were not used in their area, and, if they had ever been in use, why they were abandoned.

Questionnaire returns. Sixty of a possible seventy-nine questionnaires (75.9 per cent) were completed and returned. Table XVII presents the distribution of the completed questionnaires according to school jurisdiction and whether or not a bursary program was in operation in 1966-67.

TABLE XVII

DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED FROM
SUPERINTENDENTS

Bursary Program Operative in 1966-67?	School Jurisdiction		Total
	City	Non-city	
Yes	4	45	49
No	5	6	11
Totals	9	51	60

As shown in Table XVII, forty-nine respondents, four from city and forty-five from non-city jurisdictions, reported on bursary programs which were in operation in 1966-67. Eleven respondents, five from city and six from non-city areas, answered questions specific to jurisdictions which did not operate bursary programs in the year of the study.

Categorization of respondents. Of the forty-nine respondents who reported a bursary program in operation in 1966-67, nineteen had five or less years experience as a superintendent while thirty had more than five years. From comments such as, "We have just started a bursary program ..." it was possible to identify eleven jurisdictions in which inexperience with bursaries was admitted. For purposes of analysis it was decided to categorize superintendents in the following ways:

Category 1: Respondents were dichotomized according to years of service. The subgroups formed were: (a) Superintendents with five or less years of service; and (b) Superintendents with more than five years of service.

Category 2: Superintendents dichotomized as reporting from jurisdictions in which experience with bursary programs was: (a) known to be limited; and (b)

experience with bursaries unknown.

Chi-square tests were applied to determine whether or not any significant relationship existed between the distribution of responses of superintendents, according to years of service (Category 1), or according to inexperience with bursary programs (Category 2). In only one instance was any significant dependency noted between the sub-groups of the two categories and the variable under examination. The particular instance in question is presented later in the chapter.

II. RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of twenty-eight superintendents enclosed the forms normally exchanged between their particular board and bursary recipients. Data obtained from an analysis of this source of information were considered as being distinct from that reported by superintendents. Consequently, analysis of the bursary documents formed the substance of the following chapter, Chapter VII.

Factual Details Reported by Superintendents

Bursaries versus teaching commitment. Each superintendent was asked to indicate the maximum number of bursaries which his particular board would grant to an individual recipient. The superintendent was then requested to state the teaching commitment required of the recipient of a

maximum number of bursaries. The responses to these questions are summarized in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII
MAXIMUM BURSARIES ISSUED VS REQUIRED
TEACHING COMMITMENT

Maximum Bursaries Issued	Required Teaching Commitment (Yrs.)					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	2	0	0	0	3
2	0	17	7	1	0	25
3	0	2	6	0	0	8
4	0	0	1	9	2	12
Total	1	21	14	10	2	48 ¹

¹One additional board granted a single bursary, spread over two years, with a teaching commitment of 3 years.

The following points were extracted from the information recorded in Table XVIII.

- (1) Three boards were reported as offering a maximum of one bursary to a student while twenty-five boards offered a maximum of two. Eight boards offered three, and twelve boards offered a maximum of four bursaries to a student during his university career.
- (2) The most common combination of bursary and teaching commitment was a maximum of two

bursaries for a two year teaching commitment.

- (3) In thirty-three cases (67.3 per cent)

bursaries were granted on a ratio of one bursary to one year of teaching commitment.

- (4) The ratios of numbers of bursaries to years of teaching commitment ranged from a low of 1 : 0.66 to a high of 1 : 2 years. The overall ratio for all areas reported was one bursary for a teaching commitment of 1 : 1.6 years.

Bursaries granted per year. Four of the forty-nine boards (all non-city areas) were reported as making it a practice to grant more than one bursary to an individual in a single year. One superintendent named "need" as the criterion under which this was done. Three other superintendents indicated that their boards would grant more than one bursary to students who had not previously held a bursary and would be available for teaching duties in the following year. The remaining forty-five superintendents indicated that their boards did not grant more than one bursary per student per year. One board, however, was prepared to offer additional money as a loan where need could be established.

Determination of bursary quota. In forty of forty-nine jurisdictions boards were reported by superintendents

as being "flexible" as far as granting bursaries was concerned. In these cases the number of bursaries granted was determined by the number of applicants.

In ten instances boards were reported as establishing a specific number of bursaries per year. Commonly the criteria in these cases was a prior assessment of the teacher supply situation. One board set the number of academic bursaries at a specific number but was flexible as to the number of vocational bursaries offered.

In setting a specific number of bursaries for the 1966-67 school year these ten boards were reported as experiencing:

- (a) more bursaries than applicants (five cases);
- (b) approximately equal numbers of applicants as bursaries (two cases);
- (c) more applicants than bursaries (three cases).

In all but two instances the circumstances cited for the 1966-67 school year were described by superintendents as, "the usual case". The exceptions balanced each other with one superintendent selecting condition (a) and another condition (c) as not being, "the usual case".

Advertising the programs. The most frequently reported method of making bursary programs known to potential recipients was, "Announcements in schools by staff members". Of all methods reported, 63.5 per cent were those directly associated with high schools.

Selection of applicants. In forty-three of the forty-nine school jurisdictions (87.8 per cent) a bursary candidate was required to complete a formal application form. Recommendations from principals or guidance counsellors were required in twenty-nine areas (59.2 per cent). In thirty areas (61.2 per cent) candidates were interviewed. In the majority of cases these interviews were conducted by the superintendents.

Four school jurisdictions would not grant bursaries to students from outside their own area. Of the forty-five who would, forty gave preference to local students. Five superintendents reported that their areas gave no preference to candidates. These five areas were all non-city jurisdictions.

Do Boards Specify Years of Training?

For a student entering first year university as a bursary recipient a requirement to teach after a specific number of bursaries was viewed as tantamount to establishing the years of training he or she would receive.

Superintendents were asked to state whether or not it was a condition of their bursary program that students undertake their teaching commitment after receiving a specific number of bursaries. If "Yes", the number of such bursaries was requested. Replies are summarized in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

DO BOARDS REQUIRE TEACHING SERVICE AFTER A
SPECIFIC NUMBER OF BURSARIES?

Response	Condition	Frequency
"Yes"	After 2 bursaries	11
	After 3 bursaries	3
	After 4 bursaries	1
	Number Not Specified	4
Total "Yes"		19
"No "	May be deferred for further study	18
	Not a condition of the bursary	11
Total "No"		29

Note: One superintendent did not complete the question.

Superintendents indicated that nineteen (39.6 per cent) of the boards cited in Table XIX required recipients to begin their teaching commitment after having received a specific number of bursaries. In eleven of these cases recipients were required to teach after having received two bursaries. Three boards required teaching after three bursaries, one board after four bursaries, while in four cases superintendents did not state the specific number of bursaries granted before teaching was required.

Further from Table XIX, twenty-nine superintendents (60.5 per cent) replied "No" to the question of whether teaching was required after a set number of bursaries was granted to a recipient. In eighteen of these cases the commitment could be deferred until the recipient had completed additional years of training. However, added comments by superintendents indicated that in six of the eighteen jurisdictions, deferment would be the exception to the rule. In eleven instances superintendents reported that teaching after a specific number of bursaries was not a condition of the program operated by their board.

Opinions of Superintendents In Regard To Bursaries

In section three, which was the largest section of the questionnaire, superintendents were asked to provide their personal views or estimates on a variety of questions regarding school board bursaries. Initially the questions focused on factors which might bear a relationship to whether or not bursary recipients would return to the area which granted them a bursary. Later questions were of a more philosophical nature dealing with such personal views as to whether superintendents were in favor of bursary programs, or what disadvantages or advantages they saw in bursaries. Throughout this section, superintendents were encouraged to add additional commentary or explanation as they deemed appropriate.

Estimates of Recipient Return

Superintendents were asked to estimate the percentage of bursary recipients who: (a) fulfilled their entire teaching commitment; (b) fulfilled part, but not all, of the commitment; and (c) the per cent who failed to render any of the teaching commitment.

The range in estimates for each category was as follows:

Recipients who completed -

(a)	the entire commitment	--	10	to	100 %
(b)	part of the commitment	--	5	to	98 %
(c)	none of the commitment	--	0	to	75 %

The averages of the estimates made by superintendents who attempted the question were as follows:

Recipients who completed -

			<u>Average Estimate</u>
(1)	the entire commitment	--	68.5 %
(2)	part of the commitment	--	18.8 %
(3)	none of the commitment	--	12.7 %

One superintendent reviewed the actual history of bursary recipients in his area since 1961 and reported that:

- (1) 43.0 per cent completed the entire commitment;
- (2) 21.0 per cent fulfilled part of the teaching obligation; and
- (3) 36.0 per cent failed to render any service to the board.

Why Do Students Fail To Meet Their Teaching Commitment?

Superintendents were asked to list the most common reasons which they have found to account for students of each sex not returning to attempt the bursary teaching commitment. Three superintendents left this question unanswered. One explained that his area's program had just been inaugurated and no experience had been obtained in regard to non-returnees. The remaining forty-six superintendents of the sample listed a total of sixty-three reasons for males and sixty-seven reasons for females failing to return. These reasons are presented in Table XX. For purposes of comparison the frequency of each response is given as a percentage of the total number of reasons given for each sex.

As may be noted from Table XX the first three reasons which superintendents gave for males failing to meet their teaching commitment were (in order of priority):

- (1) more attractive positions elsewhere;
- (2) failure at university; and
- (3) a desire to remain in a city.

Setting aside "failure at university", and considering the other two points as reflections on the areas from which students receive their bursaries, it may be contended that superintendents see dissatisfaction with local conditions as accounting for over half (52.3 per cent) of the reasons why males fail to return to complete the teaching commitment.

TABLE XX

WHY BURSARY STUDENTS DO NOT RETURN
- AS SEEN BY SUPERINTENDENTS -

Reason	Males	Females
1. More attractive positions elsewhere	31.8 %	9.0 %
2. Marriage	0.0	52.2
3. Failure at university	27.0	13.4
4. Desire to remain in cities	20.5	16.4
5. Continue studies	15.1	3.0
6. Other reasons	2.8	3.0
No problems with non-returnees	2.8	3.0
	100.0 %	100.0 %

In the case of females the three main reasons given were:

- (1) marriage;
- (2) a desire to remain in a city; and
- (3) failure at university.

Of these, "marriage" alone accounted for over half of all the reasons supplied by superintendents to account for the non-return of female bursary recipients.

Is There a Moral Commitment to a Bursary Contract?

Superintendents were asked to indicate "yes" or "no"

to the question, "Do you feel that a bursary recipient has a moral as well as a financial commitment to the board which grants the bursary?" The replies to this question are summarized as follows:

<u>Reply</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Yes	42
No	$\frac{3}{45}$

Four respondents did not indicate either "Yes" or "No". Three said that, "Only a financial commitment existed". The fourth indicated that the commitment was "Partly moral".

The forty-two superintendents who indicated that a moral commitment existed in a bursary contract represented 85.7 per cent of the sample. It may be recalled from Chapter IV, page 76, that 79.2 per cent of the student recipients of bursaries indicated that only a financial commitment was involved in the acceptance of a bursary.

Additional comments by superintendents. Eleven superintendents took advantage of the opportunity provided in the questionnaire to supply additional commentary. Four of the eleven supported their affirmative answer to the question of moral commitment. Typical of these remarks was the statement of one superintendent that, "The contract is binding only morally and not legally".

Six superintendents, who held that a moral commit-

ment to teach was not incumbent on a bursary recipient, enlarged upon their views. The provision of a repayment clause in a bursary contract was, some of these six noted, recognition of financial but not moral commitment. One of these superintendents remarked, "Inexperienced youngsters shouldn't be faulted for breaking their decision once they have experienced urban life." The eleventh superintendent who added a comment simply noted that, in his experience, students did not seem to see any moral commitment to the contract.

Influence of Bursaries on Teacher Training

Superintendents were asked to estimate the percentage of school board bursary recipients who they believed had decided on a teaching career primarily because of the availability of bursary funds. Forty-one superintendents attempted this estimation. The range of replies extended from "negligible" to a high of 75 per cent. Thirty-three of the forty-one respondents made estimates of twenty-five per cent or less. Ten estimated the percentage as "negligible" or "insignificant". If these later be given an arbitrary value of one-half of one per cent, then the average estimate of the proportion of students who take teacher training because of the availability of bursaries was 14.1 per cent.

Attacking the question from a somewhat different slant, superintendents were asked to select one of four

categories which would best describe what influence their particular bursary program had on the number of students from the local area who took teacher training. All forty-nine superintendents responded to this question. The question and the responses were as follows:

"To what degree did your bursary program influence the number of local students who took teacher training?"

<u>Degree of Influence</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
(a) Considerable	6
(b) Moderate	17
(c) Slight	23
(d) Negligible	3

A total of twenty-six superintendents (53.1 per cent) chose "slight" or "negligible" as descriptive of the influence bursaries had on the number of students who took teacher training. The remaining 46.9 per cent of the superintendents judged bursary influence as "moderate" to "considerable".

The Likelihood of The Return of Recipients

Superintendents were asked to judge the significance of six different factors in regard to their possible relationship to the likelihood of a bursary recipient's return to attempt the teaching commitment. The factors were:

- (1) sex;
- (2) marital status;
- (3) value of the bursary;
- (4) distance from an urban center;
- (5) university entrance standing; and

- (6) the year of training in which the recipient was registered on receipt of the bursary.

The percentage of superintendents who estimated the significance of each factor as "Very", "Moderately", "Slight" or "Not Significant" are tabulated in Table XXI.

As indicated in Table XXI, approximately three-quarters of the superintendents judged "distance from an urban center" and "value of the bursary" as being moderate to very significant in regard to the likelihood of the return of a bursary recipient to attempt the teaching commitment. "Marital status" and "year of training in which the recipient was registered on receipt of the bursary" received almost equal evaluation by superintendents. These factors were judged as moderate to very significant by 58.9 and 58.4 per cent of the superintendents respectively. Married applicants were selected by superintendents in a ratio of 3 : 1 over single applicants as most likely to return to attempt the teaching commitment.

Superintendents who saw some relationship between the year of training in which a student received a bursary and the likelihood of his return were asked to indicate which year was best. The replies by twenty-seven superintendents were as follows:

<u>University Year</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
First	1
First or Second	1
Second	13
Third	2
Third or Fourth	5
Fourth	3
"Any year but the first"	2
	<u>27</u>

TABLE XXI

PER CENT OF SUPERINTENDENTS ESTIMATING VARIOUS DEGREES OF SIGNIFICANCE OF SIX FACTORS IN REGARD TO LIKELIHOOD OF THE RETURN OF A BURSARY RECIPIENT

Factors	(1) Very	(2) Moder- ate	Total (1) + (2)	(3) Slight	(4) Not Sign- ific- ant	Total (5) + (6)
Distance from Urban Center	24.5	48.9	73.4	11.1	15.5	26.6
Bursary Value	27.1	45.8	72.9	16.7	10.4	27.1
Marital Status	15.4	43.8	58.9	30.4	10.7	41.1
Year of University Training	6.3	52.1	58.4	18.7	12.9	41.6
Sex	8.6	28.3	36.9	30.4	32.7	63.1
University Entrance Stand- ing	4.3	29.2	33.5	14.4	52.1	66.5

Note: Because the number of superintendents who judged each factor varied somewhat, degrees of significance were given in per cent. Thus the upper left hand figure indicates that 24.5 % of the superintendents felt that "distance from an urban center" was a very significant factor in the likelihood of the return of a bursary recipient.

In addition, four superintendents did not pinpoint a particular year but stated, in effect, that the more bursaries received by an individual the greater the chance of his return.

As shown in Table XXI the majority of superintendents (63.1 per cent) considered sex as of slight or of nil significance in regard to the likelihood of the return of a recipient to attempt the teaching commitment. However, chi-square analysis of the replies indicated that the "very" and "moderate" scores were significantly related to sex with males accorded a higher proportion of such scores than females.

A higher proportion of superintendents who were not credited as "unfamiliar with bursary programs" chose males as more likely to return and attached greater importance on sex than did the proportion of superintendents who had indicated a lack of experience with bursaries. Chi-square tests indicated that the difference in the relationship of familiarity with bursaries and the importance attributed to sex was statistically significant at the .02 level of confidence.

Although chi-square tests were conducted on the distribution of superintendent scores for all six "return" factors, judgements on the significance of sex proved to be the only instance in which the eleven respondents of declared unfamiliarity with bursary programs differed measureably from the thirty-eight other superintendents.

In no instance did replies from superintendents with five or less years of experience differ significantly in relationship from those with more than five years of experience.

Sex and marital status. Further to the question of the likelihood of return, respondents were asked to identify by sex and by marital status the applicants for school board bursaries deemed most likely to attempt the teaching commitment. Married males were most frequently chosen as most likely to return while single females were selected as least likely to return. The per cent of respondents making these particular choices were 43.8 and 47.9 per cent respectively. Eight superintendents (16.6 per cent of the respondents) indicated that they saw no significant difference in the sex - marital status of a bursary applicant in regard to the likelihood of return.

University entrance standing. Of the six factors examined, the university entrance standing of a bursary applicant was considered by superintendents to be of least significance in regard to the likelihood of the return of a bursary applicant to attempt the teaching commitment. As indicated in Table XXI, almost two-thirds (66.5 per cent) of superintendents who provided an estimate of the significance of this factor classed it as of slight or of no significance.

Factors selected by superintendents as related to recipient return. After estimating the significance of six factors provided in the questionnaire, superintendents were asked to list in order of importance those factors which they believed were most positively related to the likelihood of a bursary recipient returning to undertake the teaching commitment. None of the six factors previously mentioned in the questionnaire were selected among those most frequently mentioned by superintendents. Instead, factors at the local level were named most often by superintendents as important to a bursary recipient's decision to return to fulfill the teaching commitment.

A total of ninety-five points were listed by superintendents as positively related to the return of a bursary recipient. Fifty-six of these points (58.9 per cent) were related to local conditions. Six sub-categories of "local conditions" which developed were as follows (frequency of response in brackets):

- (1) Placement of bursary recipients in grade and subject area appropriate to training. This was the first choice of the majority of the respondents. (N = 30).
- (2) Location and type of school in which to teach. (N = 18).
- (3) Community conditions: particularly suitable housing and a reasonable social life. (N = 12).

- (4) Familiarity with the local scene: family or other interests located in the area.
(N = 10).
- (5) High salary schedule. (N = 2).
- (6) Reasonable access to an urban area. (N = 2).

Other factors regarded by superintendents as positively related to the return of bursary were as follows:

- (1) The value of the bursary. (N = 9).
- (2) Marriage before teaching (seen as a negative factor). (N = 8).
- (3) Student acceptance of the bursary contract as a moral commitment. (N = 8).
- (4) Males considered more reliable than females.
(N = 6).

Listed three or less times in frequency were the following:

- (1) high university entrance standing;
- (2) previous teaching experience;
- (3) maturity of the recipient; and
- (4) continued communication between board and recipient.

Superintendents and The Monetary Value of Bursaries

Superintendents were asked to provide an answer to the following question: "In your judgement what would be a reasonable bursary in terms of the interests of both

students and boards?" It may be recalled that a similar question was asked of bursary recipients. Comparative answers were as follows:

	<u>Students</u>	<u>Superintendents</u>
Range	\$200-\$5,000	\$300-\$1,500
Median Value	500	500
Value most Frequently given	500	500

Note: The most commonly mentioned teaching commitment for a single bursary of \$500, as noted above, was one year of service to a board.

At first glance it would appear that the two groups of respondents differed fairly substantially in the range of proposed bursary values. When it is recalled that school boards contribute only one-fifth of a \$5,000 vocational bursary, the range proposed by superintendents (\$300-\$1,500) is in effect more costly to the boards than that proposed by students (\$200-\$5,000).

A pattern which appeared to emerge from the bursary values named by superintendents and garnered from the remarks written into the questionnaire was that bursaries should increase in value as students completed further years of training. Bursaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,500 were usually designated as being for students in their last year of the degree program or for students taking specialized training.

Do Superintendents Favor Bursaries?

"Are you in favor of school boards granting teacher training bursaries?" Space in the questionnaire was left for an open-ended reply to this question and for additional comments. All forty-nine respondents replied to this particular question. Their answers fell into four categories as follows:

"Are you in favor of school board bursaries?"

<u>Reply</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Yes	37
No	4
Not in principle	2
Have reservations	6
	<u>49</u>

It may be noted that thirty-seven superintendents (75.5 per cent) replied "Yes" to the question of favoring bursaries while the remainder (24.5 per cent) did not give an affirmative reply.

Reasons for favoring bursaries. A total of forty reasons were supplied by twenty-eight of the thirty-seven superintendents who answered "Yes" to the question of favoring bursaries. The categories of reasons given and the frequency of replies (indicated in brackets) were as follows:

- (1) Meet a local need for teachers. (N = 12)

Respondents who gave this view appeared to speak for areas which had difficulty in staffing schools. "I don't know what we would

do without them," was the remark made by one superintendent. Another, perhaps more typical reply in this category was, "We have found it a useful device for teacher recruitment."

(2) Assist Students in getting an education. (N = 11)

Reasons in this category appeared to reflect an altruistic view of the value of bursary programs to students.

(3) Attracts students to teaching. (N = 5)

Bursaries were seen as doing more than meeting local staff needs. They were regarded as a means of enlarging the total teacher supply to the general benefit of all boards.

(4) Necessary to compete with other boards. (N = 4)

Respondents in this category qualified their "Yes" answer to favoring bursaries by indicating that they maintained the practice primarily in order to compete with other boards for teachers.

Reasons given with a frequency of three times or less included:

- (1) seeing a value in local level participation in encouraging teacher training;
- (2) support for bursaries, but only from the provincial level;
- (3) favoring bursaries but only for those teachers who were already in service; and
- (4) in favor of bursaries but against ease with

which contractual obligations have been broken.

Negative reactions to bursaries. Additional commentary was supplied by eleven of twelve superintendents who did not reply in the affirmative in regard to favoring bursaries. Eight of these superintendents were strongly against bursaries while three indicated a certain degree of support. The general tone of the negative responses was much more virulent and heated than that of the comments which supported bursaries. Classification proved somewhat difficult. However, the following four reactions appeared common to the dissenters:

- (1) Returns in teacher supply did not warrant the investment in time, trouble and money.
- (2) The method itself was of a dubious nature.
- (3) The relation between school board and student recipient was often unsatisfactory.
- (4) Bursary programs existed only because of board competition.

The following quotation, taken verbatim from one of the returned questionnaires, sums up these arguments and provides an indication of the heat of the reaction:

They are hardly worth the effort. Bursaries become a means of bribery. Teachers returning to fulfill their commitment against their will are not in our best interests. There are no advantages to our board, but if other boards make the effort we must also as it becomes an implicit part of our salary schedule.

Partial support for bursaries. Three of the superintendents classed as having reservations about school board bursaries did not reply either "Yes" or "No" to the question of favoring them. One of these superintendents felt that if bursaries were to be used they should be available to all faculties. Another felt that their use might be appropriate in the rural areas but they should not be used by cities. The final comment was that vocational bursaries should be used by boards to take advantage of the provincial-federal funds but that academic bursaries, solely supported by local boards, should be abandoned.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Bursary Programs

Superintendents were asked to identify the advantages and disadvantages which their particular board found in their bursary program. The questions were open-ended. Neither a specific number of factors nor a priority was asked for. Table XXII summarizes the advantages, Table XXIII the disadvantages which superintendents noted.

As may be noted from Tables XXII and XXIII, the number of advantages listed by superintendents (seventy) outnumbered the disadvantages (forty-seven). The advantage most frequently repeated was "Obtaining A Supply of Teachers". This response appeared in forty-five instances and made up 64.2 per cent of all advantages cited. The major disadvantage seen by superintendents (Table XXIII) was the

TABLE XXII
ADVANTAGES OF BURSARY PROGRAMS TO BOARDS
(AS SEEN BY SUPERINTENDENTS)

Advantages to Board	Frequency	Per Cent of N*
Obtaining A Supply of Teachers	45	64.2
Encourages Local Students to Enter Teaching	8	11.4
Assists Students to Obtain An Education	7	10.0
Able to Plan Ahead	4	5.7
Assists Staff Members To Obtain Further Education	2	2.9
Leads to Internship	2	2.9
No Advantage to Board	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

* N = 70: the total number of advantages listed by superintendents.

TABLE XXIII

DISADVANTAGES OF BURSARY PROGRAMS TO BOARDS
(AS SEEN BY SUPERINTENDENTS)

Disadvantages to Boards	Frequency	Per Cent of N*
Students Not Meeting Teaching Commitment	18	38.2
Teaching Commitment Generates Poor Attitude in Student	6	12.8
No Disadvantages	6	12.8
Increased Costs	5	10.6
Increased Competition Among Boards	4	8.5
Limited Choice of Type of Teacher	4	8.5
Produces "In-Grown" System	2	4.3
Others (Frequency of 1)	2	4.3
Total	47	100.0

* N = 47: the total number of disadvantages listed.

failure of bursary recipients to meet their teaching commitments. This fault was listed in 38.2 per cent of the replies.

Final Commentary on Bursaries

Seventeen superintendents added a notation in the space left at the end of the questionnaire for "Additional Comments". These remarks have been roughly categorized under the following three headings:

- (1) Neutral commentary;
- (2) Qualified negative and positive reactions; and
- (3) Negative reactions.

It was decided that, aside from attempting a rough categorization of the final superintendent commentary, the remarks should appear verbatim. This decision was made because the open-ended nature of the limited number of responses made categorizations and frequency distributions of questionable value. The only deletions made from the quotations were remarks which might identify the individual or area concerned.

Neutral commentary

"I have doubts about how binding the contract is."

"Vocational bursaries are different than academic bursaries."

"We offer summer session bursaries ..." (values followed).

"Rural areas cannot compete with city boards."

Qualified Negative-Positive Reactions

"Would prefer a system of interest free loans."

"Not a strong advocate of bursaries but I continue to recommend them."

"The board's responsibility should be to provide bursaries for their own needs after teachers are trained. There should be special bursaries for graduates."

"Bursaries increase teacher supply but limit freedom."

"Bursary programs could be eliminated by a general agreement if other financial arrangements were made."

"Bursaries have assisted some students but have caused some to break moral commitments."

"Bursaries seem to be the only way some boards can get teachers."

Negative Reactions

"I believe the whole matter is a farce. Few students cannot complete their training for lack of funds. To me it is a sickness residual from that era where there was little financial aid."

"Bursaries are really a form of a bribe to get teachers to sign a contract. Original purpose for which bursaries were intended is often defeated."

"Bursaries don't provide any real assistance in making more teachers available. Other devices should be used -- at the provincial level."

"Probably an improper advantage is taken by a board -- to tie down an eighteen year old who doesn't know what he or she wants to do in two, three, or four years."

"I don't believe bursaries are a successful method of solving the teacher shortage. Pay teachers a little higher to start and allow them the freedom of going where they want."

"Bursaries have become bribes with competitive bidding between boards for an inadequate supply of teachers. Although we can ill afford it the ... is increasing the bursary program. This is the only way we can get Alberta trained teachers."

III. SCHOOL BOARDS WHICH DID NOT OPERATE A BURSARY PROGRAM IN 1966-67

Eleven of the sixty completed questionnaires were from superintendents or directors of personnel whose boards did not provide bursaries to students proceeding directly from high school to university for teacher training. Five responses were from city jurisdictions, six from non-city boards. Of the five city boards which (in 1966-67) had not operated a bursary program directed at high school students, two had never been involved in such a practice while three others had abandoned this type of program. Three city boards, however, did offer vocational and specialist bursaries to experienced applicants. Two small city systems offered no bursaries whatsoever.

None of the six non-city areas which did not offer bursaries to high school students mentioned the use of vocational bursaries. Four of the six had never established a bursary program. The remaining two had abandoned previous programs.

Reasons For Not Operating A Bursary Program

The "reasons" cited in this section have to do with why the boards in question did not offer bursaries to students

proceeding directly from high school to university for teacher training. Three city and two non-city boards had abandoned this type of program. Their reasons follow.

Reasons given by city boards for abandoning bursaries.

- (1) Obtaining teachers not considered a problem.
- (2) Dropped as an economy measure.
- (3) Bursaries of small value did not add to teacher supply; returns from more expensive bursaries not related to costs.
- (4) Young people like to leave the home area; bursaries prevent this.

Reasons given by non-city boards for abandoning bursaries.

- (1) Marriage, acceptance of city positions, and desire for further university training made recipients too unpredictable an element.
- (2) The resentful attitude of bursary students contrasted unfavorably with the more positive attitudes of non-committed staff recruits.
- (3) Internship programs found more rewarding than bursaries.
- (4) Little difficulty found in staffing schools.

Boards which had never adopted bursary programs.

Four non-city and two city boards had never operated programs in which bursaries were offered to students proceeding

directly from high school to university. The reason given for the two city boards was that this type of program was simply not considered necessary. Reasons given by four non-city superintendents were more varied. In two cases boards on National Defence property were restricted by policy from operating bursary programs. The reasons given for the remaining boards were as follows:

- (1) More efficient, less costly recruitment methods are available.
- (2) Students from a small area object to returning to teach in that jurisdiction.
- (3) The salary differential which in effect exists between beginning teachers with and without bursaries is objectionable.
- (4) Teacher supply is not a problem.

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter V reported on the results of a questionnaire sent to all Alberta school superintendents. The sixty replies represented 75.9 per cent of the sample. Forty-nine superintendents reported that their boards offered a bursary program in 1966-67 while eleven replies were from superintendents whose boards did not. Superintendents were asked to provide both factual details and personal opinions about bursaries.

Number of bursaries and teaching commitment. The

majority of boards (58.4 per cent) were reported by superintendents as granting a maximum of two bursaries per student. Two-thirds of the jurisdictions granted bursaries on a one to one basis in regard to years of teaching commitment (i.e., one year of teaching per bursary). Only a small minority (8.2 per cent) of the areas would grant more than one bursary per year per individual. The total number of bursaries which forty of forty-nine boards had decided to grant in 1966-67 was contingent on the number of applicants. Definite, pre-determined quotas, were set by the remainder of the boards.

Advertising and selection procedures. The local schools were cited by superintendents as the most frequently used avenue to acquaint students with bursary programs. Formal application forms were required by all but five of the forty-nine areas represented in this sample. Interviewing of candidates plus obtaining recommendations from high school personnel were standard practices in approximately 60 per cent of the areas.

Must recipient teach after a specific number of bursaries? Eleven of the forty-nine superintendents indicated that fulfillment of the teaching commitment after a specific number of bursaries was not a condition of the bursary. In eighteen of the remaining thirty-seven areas

the teaching commitment, while apparently in the contract, could be deferred for further study. In the remaining nineteen cases the superintendent indicated that teaching service after a specific number of bursaries was indeed required. In the majority of these latter cases (eleven of the nineteen) teaching service was required after two bursaries were received by a student.

Opinions of Superintendents

Completing the teaching commitment. Superintendents supplied a wide range of estimates in regard to the proportion of bursary students who completed the teaching commitment. The average of all estimations made by superintendents was that approximately two-thirds of the bursary recipients completed their entire teaching commitment, about 20 per cent fulfilled part of the commitment, while 12 per cent did not fulfill any of the commitment.

Reasons for not meeting the commitment. The three reasons superintendents most frequently gave for males not meeting their teaching obligations were:

- (1) more attractive positions elsewhere;
- (2) failure at university; and
- (3) a desire to remain in a city.

"Marriage" was the major reasons seen for females failing to return, while "failure" and "a desire to remain in a city" were indicated as lesser factors.

Moral commitment. By far the larger proportion of the superintendents (85.7 per cent) considered that a moral as well as a financial obligation existed on the part of the bursary recipient to the granting board. A total of seven superintendents (14.3 per cent) indicated that the only moral commitment was in regard to bursary repayment if the contract was broken.

Bursaries and the decision to take teacher training. Superintendents generally negated the idea that the availability of bursaries had much influence on the decision of students to take teacher training. Less than 15 per cent of the recipients were seen (on the average) as being attracted to teacher training through bursaries. More superintendents (approximately 45 per cent) were of the opinion that bursaries had a moderate to considerable influence on the number of students from their jurisdictions who eventually took teacher training. However, it was the opinion of the majority that bursaries attracted few students to teaching and had little or no influence on the number of students who were interested in becoming teachers and who ultimately attended university for that purpose.

Factors related to the likelihood of the return of a bursary recipient. Superintendents were asked to judge the degree of significance of six given factors in regard

to the likelihood of a bursary recipient returning to attempt the teaching commitment. In the collective estimate of superintendents the factors, from most to least significant, were:

- (1) Distance from an urban center.
- (2) Value of the bursary.
- (3) Marital status of the applicant.
- (4) Years of university training.
- (5) Sex of recipients.
- (6) University entrance standing.

Superintendents were next asked to outline the factors which, in their experience, they felt were most relevant to the return of a bursary recipient. The six factors outlined in the questionnaire, and which had previously been judged by the respondents, appeared only occasionally in the lists supplied by the superintendents. The majority of the factors listed were concerned not with the recipient himself but with the nature of the local situation in which he was expected to render teaching service. "Local conditions", with particular emphasis on placing a bursary recipient in a school, grade, and subject area appropriate to his talents and training were the most frequently mentioned factors which superintendents considered as positively related to the return of a bursary recipient.

A reasonable bursary. Superintendent response to

the question of what would be a reasonable bursary closely paralleled the replies made by students to a similar question. The median value, and also the one most frequently mentioned, was a \$500 bursary for a one year teaching commitment.

Do superintendents favor bursaries? Slightly over 75 per cent of the superintendents stated that they were in favor of school board bursaries. The reasons given by those who took this stand were:

- (1) bursaries help meet a local need for teachers;
- (2) they assist students in getting an education;
- (3) they attract students to teaching; and
- (4) bursaries were necessary in order to compete with other boards.

Approximately 25 per cent of the superintendents did not favor bursaries. Their reasons, often of a vitriolic nature, cast doubt upon the following:

- (1) the amount of the investment versus the return in personnel;
- (2) the propriety of the method itself;
- (3) the relationship between board and bursary recipient; and
- (4) the competitive nature of the programs.

Advantages - Disadvantages - Final comments. Superintendents selected, "Obtaining a Supply of Teachers" as

the primary advantage of a bursary program to a school board. This choice over-shadowed all others. The major disadvantage (exceeding the second choice by a factor of three) was seen as the failure of some students in not meeting their teaching commitment. Final commentary, ranging from negative through neutral to positive reactions, was provided by seventeen of the forty-nine superintendents who replied to the section of the questionnaire specific to superintendents in whose jurisdiction a bursary program was in effect in 1966-67. Their statements were quoted verbatim in the text of the report.

Boards which did not offer bursaries. Eleven respondents reported on the reasons why their boards did not operate bursary programs in 1966-67. A recurrent theme from both the areas which had abandoned programs and from those which had never offered bursaries was the statement that staffing was not a serious problem. Further reasons given closely paralleled the points made by superintendents who did not favor school board bursaries or who had cited their disadvantages. These reasons were:

- (1) a poor return for the investment;
- (2) poor relations between board and committed students; and
- (3) dissatisfaction of young people in regard to teaching in their home area.

CHAPTER VI

AN EMPLOYMENT HISTORY OF A SAMPLE OF BURSARY RECIPIENTS FROM 1961 - 62

In Chapter III descriptive statistics were presented in regard to the participation and monetary involvement of Alberta school jurisdictions in granting bursaries to teacher trainees. In Chapters IV and V student and superintendent opinions, estimates and ideas concerning bursaries were reviewed and analyzed. In order to provide balance to the thesis it was decided to survey the teaching careers of a sample of bursary recipients from an earlier year. The intent was to "round out the picture". It was not assumed that comparisons between recipients of an earlier year and 1966-67 recipients would be necessarily valid in the sense that what was true of one group might have direct application to the other. Where comparisons were made the objective was to provide additional insight and depth of understanding to the bursary picture as it has developed in Alberta.

I. THE SAMPLE

The bursary recipients of the school year 1961-62 were selected for sampling. This was the earliest year in which the names of student recipients were available from the Students Assistance Board. It was felt that sufficient time had elapsed from that year to 1966-67 for

recipients to have completed their teacher education and to have some years of employment history.

Initial plans called for the names of 1961-62 bursary recipients from a given area to be included with the questionnaire prepared for superintendents. This plan was abandoned because:

- (1) the work required of superintendents in reviewing records would be extensive; and
- (2) there was no guarantee that the required information would be available at the local level.

Permission for a search through the teacher record files maintained by the Alberta Department of Education was kindly granted by the registrar, Mr. J. I. Sheppy. Accordingly, this avenue was used to trace the employment history of a selected sample of 1961-62 bursary recipients.

Delimiting the sample. The available time in which access to the Department of Education teacher records was possible did not permit the tracing of the entire 637 individuals who had received bursaries in 1961-62. Accordingly, it was decided to limit the sample to the recipients from two of the six Alberta Department of Education inspectorate zones. The selected regions (zones two and four) included both southern and northerly areas of the province and encompassed one of Alberta's major cities plus a number of smaller ones. Rural areas of both a prosperous

and relatively depressed nature were included in the selected zones. The assumption was made that the regions selected were reasonably representative of the province as a whole.

According to information from the Students Assistance Board a total of 247 individuals were 1961-62 recipients of school board bursaries from the areas selected for analysis. These 247 recipients represented 38.7 per cent of the 637 students indicated as having received a bursary in 1961-62. The distribution of the recipients as to sex and area from which their bursaries were obtained was as follows:

<u>Bursary Received From</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Cities	18	51	69
Non-cities	<u>66</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>178</u>
Totals	84	163	247

Females account for 66.0 per cent and males 34.0 per cent of the total sample. Chi-square tests indicated that the distribution of city and non-city recipients was not significantly related to sex. It may be recalled from Chapter IV that the same was true of 1966-67 recipients.

II. HISTORY OF THE RECIPIENTS

Certification. Of the 247 recipients selected for analysis, a total of 191 (77.3 per cent) received teacher certification. It is assumed that the remaining fifty-six

students (22.7 per cent) either failed to meet course standards or voluntarily decided on pursuing some other career. Of the 191 who were certified, 179 actually began teaching in Alberta. Of this number 116 were females and 63 males. No records were available concerning the twelve individuals (four females, eight males) who received certification but, as of January 1, 1967, had not obtained employment with any school board responsible to the Department of Education of Alberta. Chi-square analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between the sexes or between city and non-city recipients in the proportions of the original sample who:

- (1) received teacher certification; or
- (2) actually taught in Alberta.

Teaching history of recipients. Of the 179 bursary recipients who earned teacher certification and began their careers in Alberta, 158 were still teaching in the province as of January 1, 1967. Of these teachers, eighty-four were still employed with the board which had granted their 1961-62 bursary. Table XXIV presents a combined display of the certification and teaching history of the original 247 bursary recipients from 1961-62 who were selected for analysis.

It may be noted from Table XXIV that the highest proportion of 1961-62 bursary recipients (55.5 per cent)

TABLE XXIV

CERTIFICATION AND TEACHING HISTORY OF 247
1961-62 BURSARY RECIPIENTS TO JANUARY 1967

Circumstance	Males		Females		Total Recipients
	City	Non-city	City	Non-city	
Received 1961-62 Bursary	18 (100%)	66 (100%)	51 (100%)	112 (100%)	247 (100%)
Received Teaching Certificate	14 * (77.8)	53 (80.3)	42 (82.4)	82 (73.2)	191 (77.0)
Taught in Alberta	12 (66.7)	51 (77.3)	39 (76.5)	77 (68.8)	179 (72.4)
Still Teaching in Alberta	12 (66.7)	50 (75.7)	36 (70.6)	60 (53.6)	158 (64.3)
Started with Bursary Board	11 (61.1)	49 (74.2)	36 (70.6)	56 (52.7)	152 (61.9)
Still Teaching With Bursary Board	10 (55.5)	30 (45.5)	23 (45.1)	21 (18.9)	84 (34.0)

* - This box may be read as follows: A total of 14 of the original 18 males (77.8%) who received a bursary from a city board earned a teaching certificate.

who were still employed, as of January 1, 1967, with the board which had granted the bursary were males teaching for city boards. The smallest proportion (18.9 per cent) of those still employed with the board which had granted the 1961-62 bursary were females who had received bursaries from non-city boards.

Analysis of relationships. Chi-square analysis of the 1961-62 bursary recipients indicated that the following relationships between variables were statistically significant.

- (1) Sex and the number of teachers who started teaching for the board which granted their bursary (71.4 per cent of the males and 58.3 per cent of the females started with their bursary board).
- (2) Sex and those who remained with the bursary board (47.6 per cent of all males, 26.9 per cent of all females).
- (3) Sex and those certified teachers who were still teaching in Alberta as of January 1, 1967 (92.5 per cent of the males, 77.4 per cent of the females).
- (4) Area from which bursary received and years in the employ of the bursary board (both male and female non-city recipients spent fewer years with their boards than did city bursary recipients).

Further chi-square analysis indicated that no significant relationship existed between students who had received bursaries from city and non-city boards in regard to:

- (1) those who started teaching for their bursary board; and
- (2) those recipients still teaching for their bursary board as of January 1, 1967.

Proportion of males and females who remained with the bursary board. It was shown in Table XXIV, and noted in the previous review of chi-square analysis, that a higher proportion of males than of females began teaching for and ultimately remained with the school board which had granted their 1961-62 bursary. The raw figures for this distribution are as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Received a 1961-62 bursary	84	163.
Recipients teaching for bursary board as of January, 1967	40	44

It may be noted from these raw figures that almost twice as many bursaries were granted to females as to males in 1961-62 in order to obtain approximately the same number of staff members who were still in the employ of the bursary granting board as of January, 1967.

In noting the much higher proportion of female than male 1961-62 bursary recipients who failed either to

begin with or to remain teaching for their bursary board, the question arose as to what part marriage may have played as a contributing factor. Although it was impossible to determine from the data source whether or not a female recipient failed to report to her bursary board because of marriage, it was possible to determine whether or not she was married at the time she reported to a board other than her own. Marital status was determined by an examination of the Alberta Department of Education teacher records in which maiden and married names of females were retained. The data recorded in Table XXV resulted from an examination of these teacher records.

As shown in Table XXV, nine females from the sample who taught in Alberta were married when they applied for a 1961-62 school board bursary. Of these married applicants, four actually taught for their bursary board. Three were still with their board as of January, 1967. A total of 107 females from the sample who taught in Alberta were single as applicants for a bursary. Twenty-one of these 107 married prior to teaching, 39 were married after they had taught under their maiden name, and 47 were still unmarried as of January, 1967.

Chi-square tests (with Yates correction for cell frequencies of five or less) indicated that no significant relationship existed between married and unmarried bursary

TABLE XXV

TEACHING HISTORY AND MARITAL STATUS OF 1961-62
FEMALE BURSARY RECIPIENTS WHO TAUGHT IN ALBERTA

Marital Status	Taught in Alberta	Taught for Bursary Board	Still Teach- ing*for Bursary Board
(1) Married Applicants	9	4	3
(2) Single Applicants:			
a) Married prior to Teaching	21	16	7
b) Married after Teaching	39	35	11
c) Unmarried as of January, 1967	47	40	23
Total	116	95	44

* - Still teaching as of January 1, 1967.

Note: "Applicants" refers to "applicants for a school board bursary".

applicants with regard to beginning their teaching career with their bursary board or remaining with that board.

Further, no significant relationship existed between females who married and females who remained single in regard to remaining with the bursary board.

Bursary Recipients of 1961-62 Who Failed to Render
Service To Their Bursary Board

Of the 247 members of the sample selected for analysis, 191 qualified for teaching certification in Alberta. Thirty-six of this number failed to render any teaching service to the board which had granted them a bursary for the 1961-62 school year. The distribution of this group was as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Did not teach in Alberta	4	8	12
Taught for a different board	3	21	<u>24</u> 36

Employment history of the defaulters. Two of the three males who did not render teaching service to their boards were recipients of bursaries from non-city areas. One of these men started teaching in a city district, the other started in a non-city area. The third individual had received a city bursary and chose to start with a non-city board.

In regard to the twenty-one female defaulters, eighteen had received bursaries from non-city areas. Of the latter, six joined city staffs while twelve went to other non-city areas. Of the three recipients of city bursaries who did not honor their teaching contract, one went to another city district while two joined non-city

boards. Of interest in regard to the females, fourteen of the twenty-one (two-thirds) who did not teach for their bursary board were either married before they began teaching or were married in their first year of teaching.

Returnees. Of the 247 original 1961-62 bursary recipients in the sample selected for analysis, 158 actually started teaching for the granting board. Eighty-four of the 158 were still employed with their original bursary board as of January, 1967 while 74 had left.

From the Alberta Department of Education records it was possible to determine the number of years of teaching service between the time bursary recipients joined their bursary board and the school year ending June 30, 1966. For the seventy-four bursary recipients who joined and then left their bursary board the analysis of length of stay was as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Average number of years with bursary board	1.86	1.64
Median years with bursary board	2.0	2.0

III. CHAPTER SUMMARY

In order to provide additional insight into the subject of school board bursaries the employment history of a number of recipients (247) from 1961-62 was reviewed. Approximately two-thirds of the members of the sample were

females, one-third males.

Certification and teaching history. A total of 152 of the 247 bursary recipients (61.9 per cent) obtained certification and returned to their bursary board to attempt the teaching commitment. A significant relationship was found between sex and both returning to and remaining with the bursary board. The proportion of males who joined and then stayed with their bursary board was considerably higher than females. Students, both male and female, who held non-city bursaries spent fewer years in the employ of their bursary board than did recipients of city bursaries. By January, 1967, male bursary recipients still in the employ of the board which had granted them a bursary in 1961-62 represented 47.6 per cent of the original number of males. At the same time 26.9 per cent of the females were still in the employ of their bursary board.

Marital status. The proportions of single, female, bursary recipients who returned to and remained with their bursary boards was higher than the proportion of females who were either married as bursary applicants or who had married before January, 1967. However, the relationship between marriage and return to the bursary board approached but did not reach significance at the .05 level of confidence.

Recipients who defaulted the teaching commitment.

Slightly over one-half of the males and over one-quarter of the females who obtained certification but defaulted their teaching commitment did not teach in Alberta. The majority of those who started with other boards in Alberta had held non-city bursaries in 1961-62. Of these approximately one-third of both sexes went to city boards, the remainder went to other non-city jurisdictions.

Length of stay. Both male and female recipients who had reported to their bursary board and then had left by January, 1967, stayed a median of two years. Males averaged 1.86 years before leaving, females 1.64 years.

CHAPTER VII

BURSARY APPLICATION AND CONTRACTUAL DOCUMENTS

After a preliminary review of the topic of school board bursaries (conducted prior to the formal study) it was decided that application and contractual documents, which established in formal terms the agreement between recipient and grantor, constituted a source of information worthy of examination. The underlying assumption was that the formal documents might provide additional insight into the basic philosophy which motivated the development and operation of a bursary program.

A total of twenty-eight application-contractual bursary forms were received from the superintendents who constituted the sample reviewed in the preceeding chapter. One superintendent stated that his jurisdiction did not use a set form but prepared an original agreement for each bursary granted.

For ease of analysis the majority of the data reviewed in this chapter was first obtained from the bursary documents, coded, and then transferred to IBM cards. Because the number of forms was so limited (twenty-eight), it was decided to limit data analysis largely to percentage and raw score reports of the various categories.

The results of a survey of the documents are presented

in this chapter under three headings:

- (1) General Information About the Documents;
- (2) Personal Details Required of Applicants; and
- (3) Contractual Terms.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE DOCUMENTS

Three forms were received from city jurisdictions, twenty-five from non-city boards. Although the contractual wording was fairly similar in certain clauses of the different documents, no two were identical in format. In eight instances application and contractual agreements were combined in a single document. The remaining twenty jurisdictions, represented in this sample, provided separate formats for application and contractual agreements. In some instances policy statements were provided as separate units. More commonly such statements were included as part of either the application or contract form. Some jurisdictions prepared separate forms for high school graduates entering university for the first time and other forms for students who were already in teacher training. Documents varied in length from a single sheet (seven cases) to a high of nine separate pages which outlined one area's program.

II. PERSONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED OF APPLICANTS

All applicants were required to state their name, sex, and address. Other information which was required by

some, but not all boards, is noted in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXVI
PERSONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED IN TWENTY-EIGHT BURSARY
APPLICATION FORMS

Information	Required	Not Mentioned
Age	23	5
References	8	20
Grade 12 Marks	12	16
Last School Attended	16	12
Declaration of Program Planned	20	8
Marital Status	9	19
Reasons for Requesting a Bursary	3	25

It may be noted from Table XXVI that in five of the twenty-eight application forms neither the date of birth nor present age of the applicant was required. References were called for in only eight instances. Grade 12 marks, usually in the form of an official transcript, were required by twelve jurisdictions while the name of the last high school attended was requested by sixteen of the twenty-eight boards. In twenty cases, noted in Table XXVI, students were asked to state the type and year of program in which they were either presently

registered or planned to register. A common practice was for boards to list programs and years (example: "First year of the two year program leading to the Standard "E" Certificate") and have an applicant indicate the one appropriate to his circumstance. In three instances recipients were required by the contractual agreement to secure the approval of the superintendent for any change in university program. In two other cases, the student undertook to discuss the change with the superintendent.

As shown in Table XXVI three of the forms required the applicant to state the circumstances which made necessary the student's request for financial assistance through the bursary program. None of the remaining twenty-five formats required this information.

III. CONTRACTUAL TERMS

The following topics were examined in an analysis of the contractual terms of the twenty-eight documents studied:

- (1) The teaching Commitment;
- (2) Provisions for Breaking a Contract;
- (3) Deferment of Commitment;
- (4) Payment of Bursary Funds to Students;
- (5) Miscellaneous Contractual Items.

The Teaching Commitment

All of the forms which were surveyed included a section which outlined the teaching obligation required of a bursary recipient. The obligation was described in a variety of ways as the following indicates:

<u>Description of Bursary Obligation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Specifically stated as a <u>debt</u> to be repaid by teaching service	13
A <u>bursary</u> requiring teacher service	10
A <u>loan</u> to be repaid by teaching	3
A <u>promissory note</u> to be repaid by teaching	1
A <u>teaching contract</u> effective in a specified number of years	1
Total	28

Specification of years of training. In regard to the question of whether boards might dictate or control the amount of teacher education received by a student recipient of a bursary, the twenty-eight contractual forms were examined closely to determine what conditions, if any, were set forth as to when a recipient was to commence his teaching obligation. The conditions which were found are outlined in the following paragraphs.

Condition I. Clauses or statements in sixteen of the documents required the bursary recipient to begin his teaching commitment in the school year immediately following the successful completion

of the teacher education course in which he had registered. This type of contract required the student to specify the program and the years of training which he or she had decided to undertake. Conceivably then, a student might receive a bursary while in the second of a two year program and be required to undertake the teaching commitment in the following year. Under the same type of contract, another student might receive a bursary while in the first of a four year program and thus have another three years of leeway before the teaching commitment would be due.

Condition II. In eight contracts the teaching commitment was specifically stated as due upon completion of a two year training course and the concomitant earning of teacher certification.

Condition III. In two instances the teaching commitment was declared due in the year following the receipt of a specific number of bursaries. One of these boards specified two bursaries, the other declared a maximum of three.

Conditions IV and V. In single instances the following conditions obtained:

- (a) bursaries were granted only to students who were prepared to teach in the year immediately

following the receipt of a bursary;

- (b) no statement given as to when the teaching commitment was to be undertaken.

Provisions In Regard to Breaking The Bursary Contract

In eighteen of the contracts examined no formal procedure was stated as to how a recipient might indicate to a board that he wished to be released from the bursary. In ten documents the granting boards required a recipient seeking release to either make application in writing or, in some cases, appear in person before the board to present his case. A clause in four of the latter formats required that the student accept as final the decision of the board in regard to the granting of release from a contract and, if granted, the manner in which repayment of the bursary was to be made.

Repayment. Despite the lack of formal procedures to obtain contract release, all of the documents in the sample detailed conditions concerning bursary repayment. Twenty-two of the twenty-eight bursary contracts contained a statement to the effect that should the recipient fail to meet the teaching requirement, the monies paid to the student were "due forthwith". As noted in the previous paragraph, four boards stipulated that repayment terms were at their discretion. One board required "immediate repayment" while another stated that repayment was to

extend over a period of time equal to that in which the bursary was granted. It is presumed from the latter condition that a student who had received two bursaries in a two year period would be given a similar length of time in which to make repayment.

In twenty-three of the contracts a statement was included to the effect that repayment of a bursary or bursaries would be in proportion to the amount of teaching service still due the board. Five contract forms had no such specific provision.

Interest charges. In fifteen instances repayment of a broken contract included interest charges on the bursary. The remaining thirteen agreements made no reference to the subject. Rates varied from a low of five to a high of eight per cent. Eleven of the fifteen jurisdictions which called for interest charges set the rate at six per cent.

Contract release clauses. Circumstances might arise in which a board either does not have a teaching position for a bursary recipient or does not wish to employ the particular individual. In nineteen of the twenty-eight contracts (67.9 per cent) some provision was made for these possibilities. In thirteen of the contracts in which a release clause was included the debt or undertaking was deemed to be entirely fulfilled if a position was not

offered to a bursary recipient. In the remaining six contracts with a release clause, boards were apparently more reluctant to give up their claim on a bursary recipient. In these latter instances the recipient was deemed to be released from the teaching commitment for that period of time in which no position was available. One of these six contracts credited a bursary recipient with one year of teaching service should a position not be available. The balance of the teaching obligation, or repayment of bursary funds, was to be at the discretion of the board.

Presumably, under the conditions of the contracts which released a bursary recipient only for that period in which a position was unavailable with the granting board, a recipient might enter into a teaching contract with another board until called upon to fulfill his original obligation.

Deferment of the Teaching Commitment

In twenty of the twenty-eight contracts (71.5 per cent) provision was made for deferment of the teaching commitment. The circumstances and frequencies for the various types of deferments were as follows:

<u>Deferment Circumstance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
At the discretion of the board (nothing further specified)	7
To permit further university training	5

<u>Deferment Circumstance</u> (cont'd)	<u>Frequency</u>
--	------------------

Ill health or other circumstances judged by the <u>board</u> as beyond the control of the student	5
---	---

When considered justified by a <u>third party</u>	$\frac{3}{20}$
---	----------------

In the last instance (deferment when considered justified by a third party) each of the three boards using this system declared the Deputy Minister of Education as the "third party".

Payment of Bursary Funds to Students

While all twenty-eight contract forms specified certain conditions concerning the repayment of bursary funds to boards only twelve (42.8 per cent) of the contracts detailed how the bursary money was to be paid to the potential recipients. In each of these cases the money was to be advanced in two installments, usually in October and January. Proof of registration or satisfactory progress was required by seven of the twelve boards before the second of the two payments would be made. Although progress during the year was mentioned in relatively few of the contacts (25.0 per cent), twenty-one of the documents (75.0 per cent) called for a statement of marks at the end of a university year as proof of eligibility to receive bursary payments in the following year.

Variation in bursary value. In regard to payments

made to students, three contract forms differentiated the value of a bursary on the basis of Grade 12 marks. The division between "high" and "low" value bursaries differed among the boards with matriculation averages equal to or above 65, 70 and 75 per cent selected as the "high" cut-off points. Three contracts provided a smaller bursary payment for recipients in first year university than for those registered in subsequent years.

Miscellaneous Contractual Items

Number of bursaries available. Seven contract forms did not specify the total number of bursaries an applicant might receive from a board. Of the twenty-one which did indicate a specific number, nine stipulated that a maximum of two bursaries would be allotted by a board, while in eight other cases the maximum number of bursaries which could be received depended on the program in which the student had registered and was thus two, three, or four bursaries depending on individual choice of program. Three boards indicated that a maximum of three bursaries were available. One board provided in its contract that females could receive a maximum of two bursaries but that males alone would be permitted a maximum of four bursaries.

Parental guarantee. One-half of all the contracts (fourteen of twenty-eight) required that the parents or

guardians of bursary recipients under the age of twenty-one sign an agreement guaranteeing repayment of the bursary funds should the teaching commitment not be met.

Internship. Three of the twenty-eight contracts required the bursary recipient to intern in May and June of the year preceeding the term the recipient was to begin his teaching commitment. One of these three boards required repayment of the internship stipend as well as the bursary in the event the recipient failed to join the teaching staff in the ensuing term. One other of these three required partial repayment of the internship salary. Two boards asked recipients to indicate whether or not they wished to intern. The subject was not broached by the twenty-three remaining boards.

Where may training be taken? In only one instance was specific mention made in a contract that teacher education from other than Alberta institutions would be supported by bursaries. Three forms indicated that training could be taken at institutions "approved by the board". In the remaining twenty-four documents Alberta institutions were specified.

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

The data presented in this chapter were based on a limited number (twenty-eight) application-contractual forms received from superintendents. Wide variation was

seen in the forms received. Personal information required of all bursary applicants was limited to name, sex and address. Other details (age, references, marks, high school attended, program planned, marital status, reason for application) differed from board to board.

Contractual terms had, in a total of sixteen instances, a commonality in the designation of a bursary as a debt or loan to be repaid through teaching service. All but one of the twenty-eight contract forms were relatively specific in establishing the time at which the bursary recipient was expected to undertake the teaching commitment. In eight instances recipients were definitely expected to teach after two years of training. In the majority of the remaining cases bursary students were expected to teach after having completed the course which they had designated for themselves. Conditions for a deferment of the teaching commitment were outlined in twenty of the contracts under review. In five instances deferment for pursuit of further education was mentioned as a request which would be favorably considered by a board. The "discretion of the board" however, was the major factor mentioned in the contracts as opening the way to deferment of the teaching commitment.

In the majority of cases in which a contract was broken the bursary funds were deemed to be "due forthwith". Interest charges were stipulated in fifteen instances as

due the board if a contract should be broken. Release clauses detailing the position of the bursary recipient in the event the granting board failed to offer him a teaching position were provided in nineteen of the contracts.

Less than half of the contracts (twelve) provided details as to how the potential recipient was to receive his bursary. One-quarter of the contracts did not specify the number of bursaries available to a student. Of those contracts which did, the maximum number ranged from two to four. Internship, coupled to a bursary contract, was an integral part of the program described in the documents prepared by three boards. Finally, in regard to where teacher training was to be taken, the large majority of forms (twenty-four of twenty-eight) designated Alberta institutions.

CHAPTER VIII

FINDINGS - CONCLUSIONS - RECOMMENDATIONS - POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE STUDIES

The object of this chapter is to summarize those findings relative to the purposes which this thesis undertook to accomplish. Major findings will be outlined, conclusions drawn and recommendations made.

I. MAJOR FINDINGS

Extent of the Practice

Except for their use in Saskatchewan and by a few jurisdictions in Nova Scotia, Canadian school boards outside of the province of Alberta did not offer teacher training bursaries in 1966-67. Within Alberta however, 84.4 per cent of rural school divisions, 85.7 per cent of the counties, 77.7 per cent of city public school systems, and 21.4 per cent of independent towns operated bursary programs in 1966-67. The extent of the practice was such that one out of every seven full-time teacher trainees in the province was a bursary recipient in the current year of the study. The large majority (79.5 per cent) of recipients were in first or second year university. The remainder were in third year or beyond. In total, 690 bursaries were granted by Alberta school jurisdictions. Non-city boards accounted for 553 of these bursaries.

The vast majority of these non-city bursaries were offered to high school students, while just under 2.0 per cent were vocational bursaries. City school boards granted 137 bursaries in 1966-67. Slightly over 50 per cent were of the vocational type. The two largest city public school systems of the province did not offer bursaries to high school students but did grant vocational bursaries to potential vocational instructors.

Financial Details

The total value of all bursaries reported granted in Alberta in 1966-67 was \$591,800. Local school boards contributed \$306,200 of the total while the remainder (\$285,600) was provided by the federal and provincial governments. Funds provided by the latter governments were all directed towards vocational bursaries. The average cost to city boards of the bursaries they granted was \$594, and for non-city boards \$406. However, non-vocational bursaries offered by cities averaged \$300 in value, an amount slightly less than three-fourths of the \$401 average value of non-vocational bursaries granted by jurisdictions outside of cities.

Contractual Terms

Application and contractual terms used by twenty-eight different school jurisdictions proved to be widely diversified in such areas as:

- (1) personal information required of applicants;
- (2) designation of the time at which the teaching obligation was due;
- (3) details as to conditions for deferment of the teaching obligation;
- (4) the amount of interest due on defaulted bursaries; and
- (5) the number of bursaries available from a board.

The spelling out of a recipient's obligations to a board appeared on the whole to be better organized and provided in greater detail than was the outline of a board's responsibilities to a recipient. In the majority of cases the position of the student in the event that his services were not required was not detailed. In a few instances bursary contracts contained clauses which in effect indefinitely obligated a recipient to a board even though a teaching position was unavailable. Frequently missing from the contracts reviewed were:

- (1) statements concerning the exact circumstances attending bursary payments to recipients; and
- (2) a clear outline of both the number of bursaries a student might expect to receive and the circumstances under which a board would or would not grant such bursaries.

A general finding was that far too many contractual details

were subsumed under the sobriquet, "at the discretion of the board".

Data From Bursary Recipients

One of the purposes of this thesis was to obtain information about recipients and to sample their views on various aspects concerning bursaries. Among the findings which emerged from a questionnaire responded to by 359 recipients on the Edmonton campus of the University of Alberta (87 per cent of the sample) were the following six major areas of interest.

(1) Bursary recipients were split almost exactly (a difference of less than one per cent) in a 60 - 40 ratio of females to males. Most of the females (84.5 per cent) had received their initial bursary as a teenager. A smaller majority of males (56.8 per cent) were also nineteen or under on receipt of their first bursary.

(2) Slightly over three-fourths (76.8 per cent) of the bursary holders had received their bursary from the area of their high school graduation. Approximately 85 per cent first heard of teacher training bursaries through their high school. Obtaining a bursary seemed relatively perfunctory. Approximately two-thirds of the recipients had never been formally interviewed.

(3) The average teaching commitment per bursary was 1.34 years. The average number of bursaries per recipient was 1.46. Less than five per cent of all

respondents had received more than two bursaries.

(4) In regard to the question of whether or not bursaries exerted an influence on the decision of recipients to become teachers, 89.4 per cent of the respondents reported that they had decided on a teaching career before they knew of the existence of school board bursaries. In reference to making university financially available less than 1.0 per cent stated that their bursary made university attendance possible, while 13.8 per cent would "probably" have entered university without a bursary. The remainder (85.5 per cent) stated that they would have entered university regardless of whether or not they had received a bursary.

(5) A total of 88.0 per cent of the recipients declared that they intended to teach for the board which had granted them a bursary. However, the combined proportion of those who would not teach at all, plus those who did not intend to teach for the full term of their commitment, reached 40.7 per cent of all respondents. "Marriage" in the case of females and for males a desire for a change of scene or furthering their education were the primary reasons advanced by those not planning to fulfill their entire commitment.

(6) Almost four-fifths (79.6 per cent) of all respondents were of the opinion that repayment of the bursary freed a recipient of any further obligation to a

bursary board. Only 8.4 per cent of the student recipients specifically mentioned that a moral obligation existed to complete the teaching contract.

(7) A non-vocational bursary of \$500 for one year of teaching commitment was the value of bursary recommended most often by recipients as a "reasonable bursary".

Data from Superintendents

A further purpose of the study was to survey school administrators in regard to their opinions about bursaries. The following eight major areas of interest emerged from the replies to a questionnaire completed by 75.9 per cent of the school superintendents of Alberta. The first seven points were obtained from superintendents in whose jurisdiction school board bursaries programs were operated.

(1) The majority of school jurisdictions (58.4 per cent) granted a maximum of two bursaries per student. The contracts of 22.4 per cent of the jurisdictions required that the teaching commitment be undertaken after the student had obtained the minimum training required for certification (two years).

(2) The average estimate made by superintendents in regard to the proportion of recipients who would complete their full teaching commitment was 68.5 per cent, while the estimate of those who would complete a part (but not all) of the commitment was 18.8 per cent of recipients. Those who were not likely to return at all were estimated

at 12.7 per cent. Primary reasons for not completing the commitment paralleled those given by recipients, "marriage" for girls and "interest in new areas" for boys.

(3) The large majority of superintendents (85.7 per cent) considered that recipients of a bursary had a moral obligation to fulfill the teaching commitment.

(4) Superintendents largely negated the idea that the availability of bursaries in their areas had much influence on attracting students specifically to teaching. Less than 15 per cent of recipients (on the average) were seen as being attracted to teacher training through bursaries.

(5) Opinion amongst superintendents was fairly evenly divided on the question of whether bursaries actually added to the number of would-be teachers who, through the financial assistance available in bursaries, were enabled to attend university. The majority of superintendents (55 per cent) felt that bursaries had no significant influence in regard to the number of students who were able to take teacher training, while 45 per cent were of the opinion that bursaries had a moderate to considerable influence on the number of prospective teachers who were enabled to attend university.

(6) "Local conditions", particularly those concerning the placement of a teacher in a task situation

appropriate to his training, was the main factor which superintendents believed was most positively related to the return of a bursary recipient to undertake his teaching commitment.

(7) Slightly over three-fourths of the superintendents of school jurisdictions offering bursaries stated that they were in favor of them, the remainder were not. Bursaries found particular favour among those superintendents who experienced difficulty in obtaining young, Alberta trained teachers through regular recruitment channels. Those superintendents who disliked their bursary programs noted such objections as:

- (1) a limited return in terms of the resources invested;
- (2) the "dubious propriety" of the methods; and
- (3) the development of poor relations between boards and recipients.

(8) A recurrent theme expressed by superintendents who did not operate bursary programs was that teacher supply was not a problem in their areas. Other reasons given for not having a bursary program were similar to the objections expressed by superintendents who were not in favor of bursaries.

Employment History of Recipients

A final objective of the thesis was to review the employment history of a selected sample of bursary recipients

from a year previous to the study. The sample selected consisted of 247 recipients from the year 1961-62. The following points which emerged from this survey seemed of particular importance.

(1) A total of 61.6 per cent of the bursary recipients actually returned to their bursary boards to attempt the teaching commitment. "Return" was found to be significantly related to sex with males more likely to return than females.

(2) By January of 1967, 47.6 per cent of the original number of males and 26.9 per cent of the females who had received a bursary in 1961-62 were still in the employ of their bursary board.

(3) The smallest proportion of recipients (exactly 50 per cent) of those who returned to their bursary board to undertake the teaching commitment were females from non-city jurisdictions. The highest proportion of bursary returnees (75.8 per cent) were males from non-city areas.

(4) Male and female recipients who returned to their boards and then left before January 1967 stayed a median of two years. Males averaged closer to a two year stay than did females.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions concerning school board bursaries arose as a result of the major findings of the study.

(1) Attracting teachers. Almost 90 per cent of student bursary recipients stated that they had decided to take teacher training before they were even aware of bursaries. This, coupled with the average estimate of superintendents that approximately 15 per cent of all recipients were attracted to teaching through bursaries, led to the conclusion that bursaries are not a major device for adding to the general pool of teachers. Their primary function would appear to be as a means to meet local demands for a supply of teachers.

(2) Enabling university attendance. Less than one per cent of student recipients of bursaries stated that they would not have entered university without the bursary. Approximately 14 per cent more were "probables". Superintendents, however, were more inclined to view bursaries as enabling university attendance. Accordingly a reasonable conclusion would seem to be that bursaries have a limited, but certainly not major effect, on university attendance.

(3) Extending university training. There was no evidence to indicate that school board bursaries on the whole assisted teacher education beyond the minimum required for certification (two years). In fact it appeared that bursaries functioned negatively in extending training. This conclusion seemed warranted on the basis that the proportion of teacher trainees in first and second

year university with bursaries was over twice that of students in third year and beyond. The relationship between registration year and bursary possession was found to be statistically significant. In addition, recipients themselves often stated that a disadvantage of bursaries was their restriction on university training.

(4) Moral commitment. It was evident that superintendents and bursary recipients had quite different attitudes in regard to bursary commitment. The large majority of recipients indicated that a student's obligation was nothing more than financial. On the other hand, an even larger proportion of superintendents took the view that a moral obligation was implicit in the contract. The difference in attitude led to the conclusion that rancor, bitterness, and perhaps emotional stress would not be an uncommon accompaniment to the breaking of a bursary contract.

(5) Return of recipients. "Sex" and "local conditions" were the only two factors which emerged from the study as positively related to the return of a bursary recipient. In regard to sex, a conclusion drawn from the review of 1961-62 recipients was that male recipients were more likely to complete their bursary commitments than were females. "Local conditions" dominated the factors seen by superintendents as contributing positively to the return of a bursary recipient. Lending indirect support

to the importance of making a recipient aware of a board's intention to provide suitable placement was the fear commonly expressed by recipients that since they were committed to a board they could be placed with little regard for their own preferences or abilities. It would appear that the selection of male candidates plus a reputation of reasonable placement would be the factors contributing best to the return of bursary recipients.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary recommendation arising from this thesis is that Alberta school boards which grant bursaries to high school students should carefully evaluate their present programs. It is suggested that programs be viewed with an eye to determine whether or not local bursaries improve educational opportunity, engender resentment among recipients, or may be an investment unwarranted in staff return. Should investigation reveal that bursaries are not functioning as intended, the following recommendations are presented as possible avenues of improvement.

Recommendation 1. Boards should consider directing more attention to offering bursaries to graduates of other faculties who have entered teacher training. The proportion of such students with school boards bursaries was relatively small in 1966-67. It is hypothesized that these older, more experienced bursary recipients would prove to be more

reliable than recent high school graduates.

Recommendation 2. Fear of unsatisfactory placement was common among bursary recipients. Accordingly it is recommended that every reasonable effort be made to place recipients in positions mutually satisfactory to them and to the board. It is suggested that this procedure, made known by deliberate communication and backed by reputation, might well prevent the loss of those recipients who fear placement unsuited to their abilities.

Recommendation 3. Bursary programs should be so designed that they in no way inhibit, either directly or by implication, the decision of students to remain at university beyond those years required for minimum certification. It is suggested that boards make bursaries available to at least degree standing with "satisfactory progress" as the only limiting criterion. Should this recommendation be followed, it is believed that negative reaction in regard to bursaries "hindering education" might be eliminated.

Recommendation 4. It is suggested that boards review their bursary application and contract forms in an effort to produce a comprehensive document, well detailed from both donor and recipient standpoint. Any areas which may leave the recipient uncertain as to where

he stands should be clarified. It is further suggested that the issuing of a bursary contract should not be regarded as a perfunctory office procedure. An interview in which the plan may be reviewed in detail is recommended as standard practice in a bursary program.

Recommendation 5. It is suggested that school boards establish eligibility rules designed to exclude high school students from the bursary program until such time as they have had a minimum of one year of university training or some suitable period of employment beyond the high school level. In this way criticism that school boards have an undue advantage in dealing directly with students who are still in high school might be avoided. Probably the only way this recommended procedure could be realized would be through the institution of an Alberta School Trustees' Association ground rule of bursary operation.

Program Termination

A situation may develop in which a board, after a review of its bursary program, may conclude that the dysfunctions are such that the program should be brought to a close. Should the suggested recommendations not appear as appropriate towards re-establishing the program, termination may indeed be the best course of action.

IV. FURTHER STUDIES

One of the effects of a survey type of investigation is normally to uncover or illuminate areas which are worthy of further examination. Some of the areas in which further investigation might be attempted as a result of this study are:

- (1) A follow-up study of the 1966-67 bursary recipients to determine their actual employment history. Since a great deal more is known about these recipients than was the case for the 1961-62 recipients such a study might reveal the significance of factors which in this present survey are primarily matters of opinion.
- (2) Conduct a cost analysis to determine the relative expense of obtaining staff members through bursaries as opposed to other basic recruiting devices.
- (3) Conduct a legal analysis of bursary contracts and survey whatever litigation may exist to determine the legal factors associated with school board bursaries.
- (4) Conduct a study in the field in an attempt to determine whether or not the implication is true that a bursary student's commitment to a board actually may result in undesirable

placement.

- (5) Investigate the school boards of other Canadian provinces to determine whether or not it is through conviction or ignorance that they do not operate bursary programs in the Alberta fashion.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE FROM PROVINCIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS QUOTED IN THE THESIS

DEPUTY MINISTER OF EDUCATION
PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA

C O P Y

Halifax, Nova Scotia,
May 19, 1967

Mr. R. Bryce,
Graduate Student,
Dept. of Educational Administration,
Faculty of Education,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Mr. Bryce:

I am replying to your letter of May 17th concerning the provision of "Teacher Training Bursaries" by School Boards to high school graduates who are prospective teachers.

A few of the School Boards in the Province and in particular the Municipal School Board of the County of Halifax provide what are known as "scholarships" which are, in effect, bursaries, to graduates of the high schools in the municipality who intend to take the teacher training course. Usually, these students go to the Nova Scotia Teachers' College which offers a two year course following the completion of Grade XII. I think the School Board does require a period of service in the schools of the municipality as a condition for receiving the scholarship. I can say that this practice is not very wide spread and that not more than two or three school boards in the Province operate such a plan.

The Department of Education itself grants scholarships to students in the teacher education programs in the universities, normally taken in one year following receipt of the Bachelor's Degree, and to students attending the Nova Scotia Teachers' College. These scholarships vary in amount from \$300.00 to \$500.00 and we do require as a condition of receipt of the scholarship an undertaking in the schools of the Province for at least two years. The Province also pays the tuition fees of students at the Teachers' College and in the teacher training departments of the universities if they give a similar undertaking.

Yours very truly,

H. P. Moffatt

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of the Deputy Minister

C O P Y

Avord Tower,
Regina, Saskatchewan.
May 24, 1967.

Dear Mr. Bryce:

Your letter dated May 17, 1967, has been received. In response to your enquiry, I am able to inform you that a number of school unit boards in the past have offered bursaries of the same type as those offered by division school boards in Alberta. We have no records in the Department of unit boards which offer such assistance so that I am unable to inform you of the boards now providing such bursaries.

You may be interested to know that for the next school year, the Department of Education is providing some grant assistance for school boards wishing to offer bursaries. Details of this grant assistance program are attached.

I trust that this information will be of some assistance to you.

Yours faithfully,

L. M. Ready,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

Mr. R. Bryce, Graduate Student,
Department of Educational Administration,
Faculty of Education,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Charlottetown,
Prince Edward Island

C O P Y

May 19, 1967

Mr. R. Bryce,
Department of Educational Administration,
Faculty of Education,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Mr. Bryce:

In response to your letter of May 17, I wish to say that until the present year we have been offering bursaries in the amount of \$400.00 to high school graduates who enrolled in our teacher training courses.

Since many of the students receiving those bursaries left the province to teach elsewhere, it was decided this year to cease paying them. We also felt that the salary schedule is now attractive enough to induce young people to take up teaching and remain in the province.

I do not know of any local School Board that offers bursaries to high school students who train as teachers.

Yours very truly,

M. MacKenzie
DEPUTY MINISTER and
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

ONTARIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

44 Eglinton Avenue West
Toronto 12, Ontario

C O P Y

May 30, 1967

Dear Mr. Bryce:

Your letter of May 18th addressed to Mr. L. M. Johnston, has been referred to me for reply.

A bursary in the amount of \$500.00 will be paid in 1967-68 to each teacher in training registered for a full-year term at the College of Education, Toronto, or the Althouse College of Education, London. These bursaries are provided by the Government of Ontario through the Department of University Affairs.

To my knowledge, no local board of trustees has a similar scheme in operation.

Yours truly,

G. L. Woodruff,
Director,
Teacher Education

Mr. R. Bryce,
Department of Educational
Administration,
Faculty of Education,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

APPENDIX B

A COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO STUDENT RECIPIENTS OF SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES

Note: This copy is a replica of the original,
reduced in size for inclusion in the
thesis.

QUESTIONNAIRE

TO STUDENT RECIPIENTS OF SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES

Note: The bursaries mentioned in the following questions are the type offered by school boards of the counties, divisions, and town or city districts of the province of Alberta.

Some of the questions require a written answer, some need only a check mark. (✓) Please feel free to add any comments you would like to make. All information will be kept strictly confidential.

1. In what year of Education are you presently enrolled?

First _____ Third _____
Second _____ Fourth _____

Taking teacher training after another degree _____

2. In what program are you registered in the Faculty of Education?

Elementary _____ Vocational _____
Secondary _____ Industrial Arts _____

If you are in another program, please explain:

3. What is your sex?

Male _____ Female _____

4. How old were you when you received your bursary?

5. Did you graduate from the same division, county, or district which granted you a bursary?

Yes _____ No _____

6. From what source did you find out about the school board bursary which you now have? (Please explain briefly) _____

7. Were you interviewed by anyone before you were granted a bursary?

Yes _____ No _____

If "Yes", who interviewed you? (Superintendent, assistant superintendent, board member, someone else)

Answer _____

8. Since receiving your bursary, have you had any further contact with the county, division, or district which granted it?

Yes _____ No _____

If "Yes", please explain how the contact was made. (By mail? In person? By whom?)

9. How many bursaries have you received from the board to which you are presently committed?

10. Have you ever received a bursary from another school board?

Yes _____ No _____

If "Yes", did you complete your teaching commitment or did you pay the bursary back? (Please explain)

11. Did you decide on taking teacher training:

(A) Before you found out about school board bursaries? _____

(B) After you found out about school board bursaries? _____

The following four questions (12, 13, 14, and 15) are to be answered only by those students who had no university training prior to entering the Faculty of Education.

12. What was your Grade XII average for university entrance? _____%

13. Would you have entered university even if you had not received a school board bursary?

Yes _____ Probably would _____
No _____ Probably would not _____

14. Has your board at any time indicated how many years of training they would like you to have before you begin to teach for them?

Yes _____ No _____

If "Yes", how many years were indicated?
_____ (years)

15. Did you enter the Faculty of Education in the same year in which you obtained university entrance standing from high school?

Yes _____ No _____

If "No", how many years elapsed between your high school graduation and your entrance to university?
_____ (years)

* * * * *

16. Do you plan to start teaching when you have completed:

- (A) two years of training? _____
(B) three years of training? _____
(C) a B. Ed. degree? _____

Note: If you are a graduate of another faculty now taking teacher training, please check here. _____

17. (TO BE ANSWERED ONLY BY THOSE WHO SELECTED "A" IN QUESTION 16)

If you plan to teach after you have completed two years of training, was your decision made because your bursary agreement required you to do so?

Yes _____ No _____

Explain if you wish. _____

18. According to the terms of your bursary, for how many years (in total) are you committed to teach for the granting board? _____ (years)

19. Do you plan on actually teaching for the board which granted you a bursary?

Yes _____ No _____

If "No", please explain. (All answers are strictly confidential) _____

20. If you do plan on teaching for the board which granted you a bursary, do you plan to teach for the full term of your commitment?

Yes _____ No _____
 Probably Will _____ Probably will not _____

If you did not answer "Yes", please explain. _____

21. If school board bursaries did not exist and you had your choice of where you would like to start to teach in the province, would you choose to start in the area in which you are now committed?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain if you wish. _____

22. If you had it to do all over again, would you accept a bursary from your present board?

Yes _____ No _____

Would you accept a bursary from another board?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain. _____

23. Suppose that a student who had a bursary from school board "X" decided that he wished to teach for school board "Y". If the student paid back the full amount of his bursary, plus interest, in your opinion would he then be free of any obligation to school board "X"?

Yes _____ No _____

Explain if you wish. _____

24. In your opinion, what do you think would be a reasonable bursary as far as both students and school boards are concerned?

Amount of money \$ _____
 Teaching commitment for _____ (years)
 one bursary
 Teaching commitment for _____ (years)
 more than one bursary

Explain further if you wish. _____

25. What advantages are there for you in having a bursary from a school board? (Please list) _____

26. What disadvantages are there in having a bursary?

27. If you have any additional comments you would like to make about school board bursaries, please use the following space.

Would you please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope and mail it at your earliest convenience? If you prefer, you could leave the questionnaire in Room 301 of the Education building.

Thank you for your assistance
in this study.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALBERTA SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
SCHOOL BOARD BURSARIES IN ALBERTA

Many of the following questions can be answered with a check mark (✓), while for others a brief explanation is requested. Any additional comments, criticisms, or clarifications which you would like to make at any point in the paper would be appreciated.

NOTE: If your board does not currently offer a bursary program, would you please complete the questions on the last page of the questionnaire.

Section 1. (Basic information) Would you please include with the completed questionnaire one copy of each of the following items:

- A. Bursary Application form. If you use different forms for different categories of students (Example: High School vs University applicants) please include one copy of each different form used.
- B. Contractual form. In some areas the contractual and application forms are one document. If you use separate forms, would you please include one copy of each form used.
- C. Bursary Information forms. If you prepare any pamphlets, circulars, or information forms pertinent to your bursary program, a sample copy of such material would be appreciated.

Section 2. (Factual details) Unless otherwise specified, the following questions refer to the terms of the program which provided bursaries for students enrolled in the 1966-67 University year.

-
1. In regard to a student proceeding directly from high school to university for teacher training, what is the maximum number of bursaries he or she may receive from your board before beginning to teach?

(Please Circle) 1 2 3 4

Elaborate, if you wish. _____

2. What would be the total teaching commitment for a student who received this maximum number of bursaries?

_____ Years

3. Is it a practice of your board to grant a student more than one bursary for a given university year?

Yes

☐

No

☐

If "Yes", would you please briefly explain the circumstances.

4. For the 1966-67 university year was the total number of bursaries available for distribution by your board

(a) set at a specific number?

☐

(b) flexible, dependent upon
the number of applicants?

☐

If "A", (set at a specific number) how was this number determined? (Please explain briefly).

5. If the number of bursaries was set at a specific number, did you have

(a) more bursaries than applicants?

☐

(b) approximately the same number of applicants as bursaries?

☐

(c) more applicants than bursaries?

☐

Is this the usual case? _____ Explain further if you wish.

6. How do you make your bursary program known? Please check off those methods used by your board to inform bursary recipients for the 1966-67 year.

- (a) Circulars or posters in local high schools. ☐
- (b) Announcements in schools by central office personnel. ☐
- (c) Announcements in schools by staff members. ☐
- (d) Newspaper advertisements. ☐
- (e) Circulars or posters in teacher training institutions. ☐
- (f) Listing of available bursaries with the Students Assistance Branch of the Department of Education. ☐

Others? (Please specify) _____

7. How do you select your applicants? Please check off those procedures which are required and add any others you may normally insist on.

- (a) Formal application form to be completed by applicant. ☐
- (b) Recommendation required from principal or counselor (if the applicant is a recent high school student). ☐
- (c) An interview. ☐ (If you have checked this procedure, please indicate who does the interviewing.) _____

(d) Other procedures? _____

8. Will your board grant teacher training bursaries to high school students from other areas?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", is preference given students from your own district, division or county?

Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Is it a condition of your bursary programme that students undertake their teaching commitment as soon as they have received a specific number of bursaries?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", how many bursaries are specified? _____

Elaborate, if you wish. _____

Section 3. (Personal Opinion) In this section your opinion about a number of different items is requested. If you find the responses either limited or inappropriate, your added comments would be appreciated.

10. Approximately what per cent, in your experience, of those who receive bursaries actually fulfil their entire teaching commitment?

Approximate per cent _____

Approximately what per cent fulfil part, but not all, of their teaching commitment?

Approximately what per cent fail to render any of their teaching commitment?

11. In regard to those who fail to render any part of their teaching commitment, would you please list (in order of priority) the most common reasons which you have found to account for students not returning to attempt the teaching commitment.

Males: _____

Females: _____

12. Do you feel that a bursary recipient has a moral as well as a financial commitment to the board which grants the bursary?

Yes

☐

No

☐

Elaborate, if you wish. _____

13. In your opinion, what per cent of those who receive school board bursaries have decided on a teaching career primarily because of the availability of bursary funds?

Approximate per cent _____

14. Of what influence, in your opinion, is the availability of bursaries on the number of students from your area who take teacher training?

Degree of influence: Considerable ☐ Slight ☐
 Moderate ☐ Negligible ☐

For the following nine questions you are asked to consider the significance of various factors related to the likelihood of a bursary recipient returning to the granting board to undertake the teaching commitment. If you do not consider the particular factor in question to be of any real significance, place a check mark in the box labelled, "NOT SIGNIFICANT". You need not bother to complete any other part of that particular question.

PLEASE CONSIDER EACH FACTOR IN ISOLATION.

15. In your experience, which sex is more likely to return to attempt the teaching commitment?

MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐

Note: If you do not consider the item of any significance, place a check mark in this box.

How significant is this factor?

VERY ☐ MODERATELY ☐

SLIGHTLY ☐ NOT SIGNIFICANT ☐

16. Which marital status at the time of application, is most likely to result in the return of the bursary recipient to fulfil the teaching commitment?

MARRIED APPLICANT ☐ SINGLE APPLICANT ☐

How significant is this factor?

VERY ☐ MODERATELY ☐

SLIGHTLY ☐ NOT SIGNIFICANT ☐

17. Which one of the following applicants do you regard as most likely to return for the teaching commitment?

SINGLE MALE	<input type="checkbox"/>	SINGLE FEMALE	<input type="checkbox"/>
MARRIED MALE	<input type="checkbox"/>	MARRIED FEMALE	<input type="checkbox"/>

Which is least likely to return?

SINGLE MALE	<input type="checkbox"/>	SINGLE FEMALE	<input type="checkbox"/>
MARRIED MALE	<input type="checkbox"/>	MARRIED FEMALE	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE			<input type="checkbox"/>

18. For the previous question, how significant is the difference between your most likely and least likely choices in regard to the possible return of the bursary recipient?

VERY	<input type="checkbox"/>	MODERATELY	<input type="checkbox"/>	SLIGHTLY	<input type="checkbox"/>
NOT SIGNIFICANT		<input type="checkbox"/>			

19. How significant, if at all, is the relationship between the university entrance standing of an applicant and the likelihood of his or her return to attempt the teaching commitment?

VERY	<input type="checkbox"/>	MODERATELY	<input type="checkbox"/>	SLIGHTLY	<input type="checkbox"/>
NOT SIGNIFICANT		<input type="checkbox"/>			

If you selected any other response than "NOT SIGNIFICANT", please check the range of marks you consider best related to the return of the recipient.

60-69	<input type="checkbox"/>	70-79	<input type="checkbox"/>	80 and over	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	-------------	--------------------------

Note: If this range of marks is not satisfactory, please indicate a range of your own choice.

20. How significant, if at all, is the total amount of bursary money received in relation to whether or not a recipient will return to undertake the bursary commitment?

VERY ☐ MODERATELY ☐ SLIGHTLY ☐
NOT SIGNIFICANT ☐

21. How significant is the distance an area is from a large urban center in regard to the likelihood of bursary recipients returning to the area?

VERY ☐ MODERATELY ☐ SLIGHTLY ☐
NOT SIGNIFICANT ☐

22. How significant is the year of the program (1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc.,) in which the applicant is registered, or is about to register, in relation to the likelihood of his or her return to attempt the teaching commitment?

VERY ☐ MODERATELY ☐ SLIGHTLY ☐
NOT SIGNIFICANT ☐

If you selected any response other than "NOT SIGNIFICANT", please indicate the university year which seems to provide bursary recipients who are most likely to undertake their teaching commitment.

23. Please list, in order of priority, those major factors or characteristics which you believe are most positively related to the likelihood of a bursary recipient returning to undertake the teaching commitment. Include, if you wish, factors not previously mentioned in this questionnaire.
-
-

24. In your judgement, what would be a reasonable bursary, in terms of the interests of both students and boards?

Number of Bursaries	Dollar Value	Teaching Commitment
1.		
2.		
3.		

Please comment further, if you wish.

25. Are you in favor of school boards granting teacher training bursaries?

Your comments in this regard would be appreciated.

26. What are the main advantages for your board in having a bursary program?

What disadvantages, or major difficulties, are there?

27. If you have any further comments you would like to make about bursary programs, would you please do so in the following space.

In order to categorize the data, information concerning your years of service as a superintendent is requested. Would you please complete the following table. Include your total time as a superintendent plus any years spent as an assistant superintendent.

2 years or less	<input type="text"/>	6 to 10 years	<input type="text"/>
3 to 5 years	<input type="text"/>	11 to 15 years	<input type="text"/>
16 or more years	<input type="text"/>		

Do you wish to receive an abstract of the results of this thesis?

Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
-----	----------------------	----	----------------------

Would you please return this completed questionnaire, plus the forms requested in Section 1, in the enclosed envelope.

My sincere thanks for your assistance in this study.

R. Bryce

QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR SUPERINTENDENTS WHOSE BOARDS DO NOT
HAVE A BURSARY PROGRAM

1. Would you please give the name of the division, district or county in which you are the superintendent.
- _____
- _____
2. To the best of your knowledge, did your board ever have a bursary program?
- Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Would you please briefly explain why your board does not presently have a bursary program?
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
4. Do you wish to receive an abstract of the results of this thesis study?
- Yes ☐ No ☐

Thank you for your assistance.


R. Bryce

B29881

University of Alberta Library



0 1620 1067 0055